

# THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. C.]

APRIL, 1853.

[VOL. IX.

## LOOSE THOUGHTS AND LOOSE THINKERS.\*

WE hold all conscious loose thinking to be a high crime and misdemeanour against the true morality of authorship. The publication of a man's thoughts is his professed contribution to public instruction; and how should a man dare to set up as public teacher on a subject on which he confesses his own mind to be still at fault? We have pedants and pretenders enough who profess beyond their knowledge; but these we expose and avoid as soon as we detect their incapacity. It seems, therefore, a strange recommendation to public favour that a man should set up as teacher on the very ground of his conscious unpreparedness to teach! Who needs his loose thoughts? Are they better, does he think, than other people's matured and settled ones? Then how far superior would be the matured and settled thoughts of so gifted a mind as his, whose very loose ones are so precious! Why not wait till he can give them out to his own fullest satisfaction, and to the unqualified delight of his admiring readers, who will not admire him more for the inconsistency of these thoughts with his former ones and his next, nor will feel their own minds increasingly indebted to him as their guide, for the discovery that they have laboriously fastened his first loose thoughts in their minds, only to feel themselves, a few weeks or months hence, the *ignoramuses* of his forgotten yesterday. What obligation is there upon him to publish loose thoughts? It may be right and necessary that he should have such, in his own progress as a thinker; but to himself they are the *means* and *process* to a result as yet unknown to him; and to us, the public, they are no concern at all until they have led to a result; in which case, indeed, if he thinks his result worth telling us, we shall be doubly thankful to him if, as a genuine man, he chooses to lay open the process also. When his "Yeast" has ceased to be mere froth and fermentation, we will thankfully taste the bread he offers us, and pronounce upon its savour and nutritive qualities. And now that he invites us to a day's ride with Phaethon (that hopeful but dashing and inexperienced young charioteer), we confess we would rather wait till Apollo himself shall have

\* Phaethon; or, Loose Thoughts for Loose Thinkers. By the Rev. Charles Kingsley, Canon of Middleham and Rector of Eversley. Cambridge—Macmillan and Co. 1852.

resumed the reins. Or, if we must see the loose thoughts of the world in a blaze, we cannot share the enthusiasm of those who cry, How brilliant! how warm! how clever! how charming!—but sadly yet confidently hope that Wisdom will resume his own authority, and still bless us with his mild, beneficent daylight, when the explosive thunderbolts thus rashly provoked shall have hissed and been quenched in some cooling stream of this sublunary world.

Mr. Kingsley is only one of many who, during late years (with best intentions, we trust, and with apparent sincerity), have published crude, vague thoughts,—thoughts confessedly immature,—thoughts which even to their own minds do not seem mature when they publish them,—which they have no reason to regard as their own ultimate thoughts, but every reason to believe they may yet greatly change and modify. We speak of the publication of crude thoughts on *grave religious questions*. Loose thoughts on such questions are the offence which we now indict in the Court of Authorship. We are not impugning the propriety of light thoughts on light subjects, or casual thoughts on casual topics. We admire *Punch*, in his easy, random way, because his way is not to meddle with topics unfit for loose thinking. We gladly recognize the Novel as having a true and important place in literature, always excepting the *religious* Novel, which either brings loose thinking into sacred things, or cant into secular life. We recognize in the case of the Newspaper the necessity of no little loose thinking, amid much of a more massive and enduring order, because it records the process of daily and weekly thought, discussion and opinion, out of which principles are continually evolved. But the Book, the Volume, on any secular subject, usually aims at something more definite and better worth perpetuating. And when the highest and most sacred topics of human thought and interest are concerned, conscious loose thinking we hold to be disgraceful even in a religious newspaper or pamphlet, and, in any more deliberate act of authorship, a serious crime against the true ethics of public instruction.

What obligation can there be upon any man to publish his thoughts while consciously incomplete? Does sincerity require it? Rather, the reverse: for while he doubts his own results, he ought to hesitate to undertake the responsibility of influencing others. If sincerity requires that he should tell the world what he thinks, it certainly requires that he first know it himself. And how can he expect the world will care for all that he half-thinks and loosely thinks? Is the world listening to his doubts as daily oracles of wisdom? Has not every man in the world plenty of half-thoughts and loose thoughts of his own?—which he might indeed be glad of aid from some master mind in maturing and clearing, but which will not be matured nor cleared

by the contribution of half-thoughts and loose thoughts from another mind.

But loose thoughts for *loose thinkers* expressly, is Mr. Kingsley's *recipe*. Nothing can be worse. Loose thinking is the prominent vice of our popular half-education. Men of good natural abilities, but whose school education has been merely that of reading, and whose time for self-culture is limited by the necessities of long hours at a mechanical trade, are apt to think themselves profound metaphysicians or theologians, while unacquainted, and indeed because they are unacquainted, with the progressive literature of either science. Loose thinking is the great danger of such minds; so many subjects are open before them, and they have so little time for any, while perhaps they have a taste or desire towards all. What they do read on each subject should be the very reverse of loose thoughts. It should not be dogmatic, but definite; not absolute and pompous, but argumentative and clear. It should have a purpose definitely stated and argumentatively pursued. It should express results believed in by the writer, and his reasons for so believing. To read a book so written is a good training at least into exact and logical thought, whether the reader assents or demurs to the conclusions advocated. But to take up with loose thoughts of other people on great subjects, is the sure way to dissipate the power of clear and steady thinking in oneself, and to substitute conceit.

The thinkers among what are called the "working classes" are usually profoundly ignorant on theological questions. And among this order of minds we believe it is—and very naturally so—that all that class of theological books distinguished by the vaguest tone of opinion, whether as regards natural religion or revealed, of which Mr. Foxton, Mr. Froude, Mr. Newman and Mr. Emerson, may be taken as representatives, find their most admiring readers;—whether the most competent and discriminating judges, is another question. Mr. Kingsley is a favourite with the same class, chiefly for the sake of his "religious Chartism," through which they do not as yet clearly see his ultra high-churchism, so oddly compounded with it. They approve *Alton Locke* in all but his very unnatural conversion; but do not take that conversion as the proper moral of the story. The former class of writers flatter their intellectual foible by the proposal to supersede historical investigations by an appeal to each man's intuition; the latter author is less likely to gain their assent to his method of Church authority: for this is the method suggested in effect (as we shall presently shew), though very delicately and cautiously, by Mr. Kingsley's *Phaethon*.

"It seems to me," says Professor Norton, "a weighty offence against society, to advance and maintain opinions on any important subject, especially any subject connected with religion,

without carefully weighing them, and without feeling assured, as far as may be, that we shall find no reason to change our belief. I may be excused, therefore, for mentioning that the substance of what follows was originally committed to writing more than ten years ago, and that I have not since found occasion to make any essential change in my conclusions." (*Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. II. p. 412.) This is an example of the deliberateness of thought and care in publication, for which we are pleading as the plain duty of those who speak through the press on great subjects to their fellow-men. It is a grave act to do this, however cheap printing may be, and however great the facilities for distribution. Nay, all the graver is the responsibility on this account. A free press does not abolish ethical restraints. Change and progress of opinion is, we know and avow, the law both of the individual mind and of society. We do not deprecate change or progress, but simply maintain that the change or progress should be complete and reliable in the individual before he sets about impressing it upon society. A new convert should wait awhile before he becomes a prophet. He should know his own whereabouts before he teaches others. Not only should present uncertainty make him wait, but the consciousness of frequent past changes should make him proportionately distrustful of his present certainty. It is sadly instructive to see a book of great power and clearness of style, propounding intellectual results with great definiteness and certainty, and producing considerable influence upon a large circle of readers, surviving, after a few short years, the author's next change of views; and very strange is it to find him, in such a case, announcing different views as if unconscious of the change, or putting forth an avowed change of views with equal precision of statement and definiteness of result, and unabated confidence that his new views are true, and that it is his duty to propound them to the world. There must have been loose thoughts once at least given by him to the world, to work their fascinating mischief upon loose thinkers.

These ethics of authorship are, in a minor and somewhat modified degree, applicable to publication by word of mouth. They apply in due proportion to the public speaker or teacher on whatever subject. A man is bound to know his subject (or at least to satisfy himself that he knows it) before he teaches it;—to know it at least to that extent to which he undertakes to teach it. And in proportion as the subject is important or sacred, his duty to truth is grave and absolute. The Christian preacher should "know what he says and whereof he affirms." Continuity and consistency of teaching must be looked for from him, though the word spoken from week to week may not have the same degree of deliberateness or exactness as the compacted thoughts of his book. Progress, too, in thought and opinion, should be

looked for from the preacher. But it should be progress from well-ascertained grounds, and not fickle change from one theological position to another. We do not expect to find a Christian minister one day reserving the Miracles as an open question in theology, or speaking of the doctrine of the Trinity another day as unimportant to the tone of public worship, or replacing his sermon by a lecture on Poetry or Science. A man may think this way or that way; but one way or the other, on all great subjects, he ought to decide, before he helps others to think. The great bases of belief he should have laid firmly for himself, before he professes to help others to build up their faith. In such further changes as may and ought to occur to him in the faithful progress of his own mind, he should endeavour well to ascertain each new or enlarged point of view, before he describes the mere glimpses of new truth which he had caught in his ascent. By speaking too soon, or too fragmentarily, and too confidently withal, he may be unjust to his own mature perceptions of the truth, and therefore to truth itself, and to other minds quite as desirous and as capable of truth as his own. A little attention to these evident principles of self-knowledge and respect for others' minds, would save a young preacher from many a subsequent regret for eccentricities and crudities conscientiously, but absurdly, inflicted upon minds more mature than his own. Is he to suppose the whole congregation are waiting from week to week for his next step in metaphysical or theological thought as a new discovery? Or might he not feel somewhat sad in the thought, that he cannot more quickly become a ripe-minded man, and be humbly thankful to be allowed meantime to speak the great admitted truths of natural and revealed religion, while quietly maturing his own perplexed thoughts on metaphysical abstractions and moral casuistries, into gradual harmony with the central faith of his heart? What he knows, and as far as he knows it, let him teach and communicate. Where he is learning, let him not perplex others with his crudities, but study diligently how to mature them into mental and moral nutriment, for his own soul first, and then for those of others.

It is one of the misfortunes of the public man, be he statesman, lecturer or preacher, to be compelled, as it were, to *think aloud*. Whatever change of opinion he undergoes from the time of his entrance upon public life, the public are more or less aware of it *while in progress*, and not merely when it is completed. This publicity is unfavourable to calm reflection. Its most frequent effect is to detain a man in the bondage of his first avowed opinions, and to impede the natural progress of his mind. Thus the late Sir Robert Peel's seeming inconsistencies in his Free-trade career, were explainable by his too early introduction into public life on principles of hereditary, but not personal, Toryism. He cherished the new, but still crude, opinion, while adhering

to the old policy; and when at last the old policy was renounced, the new conviction was found complete and firm. An opposite course seems to find favour with some of those theologians among us who have of late years burst through the trammels of their early creeds or beliefs—namely, that of printing every loose thought as it arises, and declaring themselves free from the old belief before they can say they have found a new one. It would plainly be better for the political and theological doubter alike, if he could quietly retire from publicity till he shall have found his new footing firm beneath his feet: but if the statesman might not be spared from public action, the theologian at least was not obliged to publish an immature book. The public could have waited for his loose thoughts to weave themselves into an even fabric, though the needs of the country could not be satisfied without bread. So the statesman, lingering with the old, yet decisive when the new must be declared, is justified;—the theologian, rash without need, decisive only in negations, and having nothing yet to offer to others' minds as fully satisfactory to his own, is justly liable to the expostulation, "Thou that teachest others, teachest thou not thyself?"

But we must say something about the Phaethon himself, whose bold avowal of "loose thoughts" on his title-page has supplied our theme thus far.

"Young Jehu must not be forgot,  
Left floundering in the flood,"

as Mrs. Barbauld has it in her charming *Phaethon Junior*.

Phaethon is avowedly a *skit* on Emerson, and a very loose as well as a very ill-natured one. It is in the form of a Socratic dialogue, with introduction and episode.

A clerical Cantab (Mr. Kingsley himself) visits a lay chum, Squire Templeton, at his seat in Herefordshire. Out fishing one day, they can catch nothing, for thinking of the previous evening's dinner-table talk, at which Professor Windrush had been the lion, introduced by some friends at Manchester, "where all such prophets are welcomed with open arms, their only credentials being that, whatsoever they believe, they shall not believe the Bible." Templeton, disgusted with the *Évangelicism* that had been urged upon him in early youth by his mother, because unable to persuade himself that he had ever experienced the mysterious emotions deemed necessary for salvation, had been reading Emerson's books, and liked them. His clerical friend, symbolizing with the "Reformed Church Catholic," cannot endure "the Professor," and is particularly shocked by his having said that Truth is practically to each man what each man troweth;—a sentiment, we believe, older than Emerson, and generally ascribed to Lord Bacon;—a sentiment more recently expressed, not by Emerson particularly, but by Coleridge before him, in imitation of the German phraseology, by saying that Truth is

*subjective* in each individual mind, though *objective* in its own essential existence. Squire Templeton's clerical friend has accordingly sat up all night writing a Socratic dialogue to disprove the assertion that truth may be one thing in itself, and a different thing as apprehended by a human mind. In this dialogue, Phaethon, Socrates and Alcibiades are the speakers. The clergyman reads it to Templeton, while the latter smokes his cigar instead of fishing. And the Platonic dialogue being ended, the friends converse together, and the clergyman persuades Templeton to resume his Plato and study dialectics, and teach the science practically to his ploughmen, in order to bring them to the doctrines of the "Reformed Church Catholic."

The Platonic dialogue is as shameful a burlesque on Socrates, as the introduction and conclusion are on Emerson. The latter is made the "representative man" for all the sins of Theodore Parker, as well as his own, against orthodox theology, and for all the added heresies of mesmerism, clairvoyance, &c.; while the good old Greek is made to talk foolishly, not wisely, about modern *subjectivity* and *objectivity*, which would have been ludicrous enough in the anachronism, if he had been allowed to converse with his known acuteness and good sense.

The whole gist of the dialogue is to demolish the distinction between subjective and objective truth; to deny that there is any difference between the absolute truth as known to God, and the truth as practically attainable by man; and to maintain that the absolute truth can be found by man,—it being gently hinted that this will be done by submission to the authority of the "Reformed Church Catholic," and by seeking the "spirit of Truth" through her offices.

"The theory which Professor Windrush so boldly started, when his nerves were relieved from the unwonted pressure by Lady Jane and the ladies going up stairs," was this: "That, if a man does but believe a thing, he has a right to speak it and act on it, right or wrong." And a good theory too, and better practice. Religion and morals are sadly hollow for want of its general adoption. Who shall dispute the right? Who shall deny that, to the man who *sincerely believes* it, a thing is right, and that to do contrary to what he believes would be wrong? This is precisely St. Paul's doctrine—that "every man should be fully persuaded in his own mind;" that "to him who believeth a thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean;" that "whatever is not of faith (from conviction), is sin." This was St. Paul's deliberate estimate of his own life, as a persecutor first and then apostle,—that he had lived in *all good conscience* always, and had received mercy for his former course because he had "done it ignorantly, in his state of unbelief." There is no higher appeal for any man than his own conscience. And if men would but act up to their own perception of what is true and right, there

were little need to sigh for an infallible external authority. That authority, at any rate, does not exist; and it were wiser to promote true reverence for the light we have, than to attempt its extinction while promising what cannot be.

Most unworthily does Mr. Kingsley throw contempt upon this "right to speak and act upon one's own convictions," from the moment of introducing it as the theme of his book. His clerical interlocutor is not ashamed to identify that sacred duty of the conscientious, with the unconscientious offensiveness of the profane. The dialogue of these Cambridge worthies runs thus—the "ribaldry and blasphemy" are their own atrocious invention:

"That, if a man does but believe a thing, he has a right to speak it and act on it, right or wrong. Have you forgotten his vindication of your friend, the radical voter, and his 'spirit of truth'?"

"What, the worthy who, when I canvassed him as the liberal candidate for \* \* \* \*, and promised to support complete freedom of religious opinion, tested me by breaking out into such blasphemous ribaldry as made me run out of the house, and then went and voted against me as a bigot?"

"I mean him, of course. The Professor really seemed to admire the man, as a more brave and conscientious hero than himself. I am not squeamish, as you know: but I am afraid that I was quite rude to him when he went as far as that."

"What,—when you told him that you thought that, after all, the old theory of the Divine Right of Kings was as plausible as the new theory of the Divine Right of Blasphemy?—My dear fellow, do not fret yourself on that point. He seemed to take it rather as a compliment to his own audacity, and whispered to me that 'The Divine Right of Blasphemy' was an expression of which Theodore Parker himself need not have been ashamed."

"He was pleased to be complimentary. But, tell me, what was it in his oratory which has so vexed the soul of the country squire?"

"That very argument of his, among many things. I saw, or rather felt, that he was wrong; and yet, as I have said already, I could not answer him; and, had he not been my guest, should have got thoroughly cross with him as a *pis aller*."

"I saw it. But, my friend, used we not to read Plato together, and enjoy him together, in old Cambridge days? Do you not think that Socrates might at all events have driven the Professor into a corner?"

"He might: but I cannot. Is that, then, what you were writing about all last night?"—Pp. 14—16.

And then we come to the Socratic dialogue, in which the theme is thus again most disgracefully misstated. Phaethon and Alcibiades, walking into the Pnyx early in the morning, meet Socrates, who tells them he has been praying that all who shall counsel there may have light to see the truth.

"And for me also?" said Alcibiades;—"but I have prepared my speech already."

“‘And for you also, *if you desire it*’—(let the reader mark this involuntary slip of our loose thinker, and ask himself how this supposed ‘desire of truth’ differs, after all, from the ‘spirit of truth’ which our Platonist scouts as Windrushian. He is compelled to talk *subjectively* now and then, in spite of himself. The dialogue goes on—) “And for you also, if you desire it,—even though some of your periods should be spoiled thereby. But why are you both here so early, before any business is stirring?”

“‘We were discussing,’ said I, ‘that very thing for which we found you praying, namely truth, and what it might be.’

“‘Perhaps you went a worse way toward discovering it than I did. But let us hear. Whence did the discussion arise?’

“‘From something,’ said Alcibiades, ‘which Protagoras said in his lecture yesterday—How truth was what each man troweth, or believeth, to be true. ‘So that,’ he said, ‘one thing is true to me, if I believe it true, and another opposite thing to you, if you believe that opposite. For,’ continued he, ‘there is an objective and a subjective truth; the former, doubtless, one and absolute, and contained in the nature of each thing; but the other manifold and relative, varying with the faculties of each perceiver thereof.’ But as each man’s faculties, he said, were different from his neighbour’s, and all more or less imperfect, it was impossible that the absolute objective truth of anything could be seen by any mortal, but only some partial approximation, and, as it were, sketch of it, according as the object was represented with more or less refraction on the mirror of his subjectivity.”—Pp. 19, 20.

Now, without stopping to settle accounts chronologically between Protagoras and the subjectivities, we see not how any one can dispute the truth of the mental phenomena here described. No one can deny that good men, and wise men, and truth-loving men, do differ in opinion, in politics, in science, in religion. They do variously apprehend and variously appreciate the same facts; and some know a larger amount of facts than others. And some of the wisest mortals have done themselves honour by their expressed consciousness that they had only made “some partial approximation to the absolute truth.” But Alcibiades goes on quoting Protagoras as saying,

“‘And therefore, as the true inquirer deals only with the possible, and lets the impossible go, it was the business of the wise man, shunning the search after absolute truth as an impious attempt of the Titans to scale Olympus, to busy himself humbly and practically with subjective truth, and with those methods—rhetoric, for instance—by which he can make the subjective opinions of others either similar to his own, or, leaving them as they are—for it may be very often unnecessary to change them—useful to his own ends.’”—P. 20.

How this *therefore* follows, we are at a loss to know. Logically and legitimately it does not. Idly, loosely, viciously and self-excusingly, it may, as any other doctrine may be perverted and abused; and so Mr. Kingsley cannot let the subject of discussion be fairly stated for Socratic, any more than Cantabrigian

argumentation, but throws an ill-natured anti-Windrushian *animus* into it from the beginning. The true inquirer does indeed "deal only with the possible." But what *is* the possible? He only knows by trial; by attempting, in fact, many things that prove in the attempt impossible, at least to him; while to another inquirer some even of those things may prove possible. A philosopher who adopts the distinction of *subjective* and *objective*, does not (if he understands his own terms) pursue the one and disregard the other. They are not two classes of facts, but facts and apprehensions respectively. He pursues the objective, and he makes subjective just so much of it as he gains,—by the very act of gaining it. It is gained, of course, under the necessary conditions of human imperfection; and this is what he means by calling it subjective truth, while he is modestly conscious that it may be short of the objective reality, or in part at variance with it. Perhaps these terms *subjective* and *objective* may be no improvement upon the older and plainer, though more lengthy, English phrases, in which we used to speak familiarly of our *convictions* of truth on the one hand, and reverently of the absolute or abstract and still veiled truth on the other, and, urging strict conscientiousness and denying human infallibility, to say that a man's truthfulness of spirit is practically his best attainment of truth. In regard to commonplace facts and occurrences, and phenomena altogether belonging to the senses, it seems absurd to distinguish between the subjective and the objective, between tangible and visible things as they are and as we perceive them to be;—what we perceive them to be, we do not hesitate to say, plainly and without reserve, they are. But the case is different with metaphysical truths, and the distinction should not be confused by any but the infallible Pope. Yet Mr. Kingsley, in order to bring ridicule upon the distinction, makes Socrates take an illustration from the former class of facts or truths, in which men's subjectivity never does (except through disease) vary from the objective fact. Very pleasant, forsooth, is the following *reductio ad absurdum* put into the mouth of Socrates; but it is only a loose thought for loose thinkers. Socrates could never have spoken it, or anything so unfair and untruthful, we are very sure.

"Soc. 'Let us see, then. Alcibiades distinguishes, he says, between objective fact and subjective opinion?'

"ALCIB. 'Of course I do.'

"S. 'But not, I presume, between objective truth and subjective truth, whereof Protagoras spoke?'

"A. 'What trap are you laying now? I distinguish between them also, of course.'

"S. 'Tell me, then, dear youth, of your indulgence, what they are; for I am shamefully ignorant on the matter.'

"A. 'Why, do they not call a thing objectively true, when it is true

absolutely in itself; but subjectively true, when it is true in the belief of a particular person?"

"S. '—Though not necessarily true objectively, that is, absolutely and in itself?'

"A. 'No.'

"S. 'But possibly true so?'

"A. 'Of course.'

"S. 'Now, tell me—a thing is objectively true, is it not, when it is a fact as it is?'

"A. 'Yes.'

"S. 'And when it is a fact as it is not, it is objectively false; for such a fact would not be true absolutely, and in itself, would it?'

"A. 'Of course not.'

"S. 'Such a fact would be, therefore, no fact, and nothing.'

"A. 'Why so?'

"S. 'Because, if a thing exists, it can only exist as it is, not as it is not; at least, my opinion inclines that way.'

"'Certainly not,' said I; 'why do you haggle so, Alcibiades?'

"S. 'Fair and softly, Phaethon! How do you know that he is not fighting for wife and child, and the altars of his gods? But if he will agree with you and me, he will confess that a thing which is objectively false does not exist at all, and is nothing.'

"A. 'I suppose it is necessary to do so. But I know whither you are struggling.'

"S. 'To this, dear youth, that, therefore, if a thing subjectively true be also objectively false, it does not exist, and is nothing.'

"'It is so,' said I.

"S. 'Let us, then, let nothing go its own way, while we go on ours with that which is only objectively true, lest coming to a river over which it is subjectively true to us that there is a bridge, and trying to walk over that work of our own mind, but no one's hands, the bridge prove to be objectively false, and we, walking over the bank into the water, be set free from that which is subjective on the further bank of Styx.'

"Then I, laughing, 'This hardly coincides, Alcibiades, with Protagoras's opinion, that subjective truth was alone useful.'

"'But rather proves,' said Socrates, 'that undiluted draughts of it are of a hurtful and poisonous nature, and require to be tempered with somewhat of objective truth, before it is safe to use them,—at least in the case of bridges.'"—Pp. 24—26.

In a spirit of levity quite unworthy his subject, our Christian preacher makes his Socrates degrade the "spirit of truth" after the following fashion:

"ALCIB. 'I assert, that whoever says honestly what he believes, does so by the spirit of truth.'

"Soc. 'Then if Lyce, patting those soft cheeks of yours, were to say, 'Alcibiades, thou art the fairest youth in Athens,' she would speak by the spirit of truth?'

"A. 'They say so.'

"S. 'And they say rightly. But if Lyce, as is her custom, wished by so saying to cheat you into believing that she loved you, and thereby

to wheedle you out of a new shawl, she would still speak by the spirit of truth?"

"A. 'I suppose so.'

"S. 'But if, again, she said the same thing to Phaethon, she would still speak by the spirit of truth?'

"'By no means, Socrates,' said I, laughing.

"S. 'Be silent, fair boy; you are out of court as an interested party. Alcibiades shall answer. If Lyce, being really mad with love, like Sappho, were to believe Phaethon to be fairer than you, and say so, she would still speak by the spirit of truth?'

"A. 'I suppose so.'

"S. 'Do not frown; your beauty is in no question. Only she would then be saying what is not true?'

"'I must answer for him after all,' said I.

"S. 'Then it seems, from what has been agreed, that it is indifferent to the spirit of truth, whether it speak truth or not. The spirit seems to be of an enviable serenity.'"—Pp. 35, 36.

And Socrates is shamelessly made to reiterate that "the spirit of truth is indifferent to the question whether facts be true or false, but only concerns itself with the sincere affirmation of them, whatsoever they may be;" adding, "Much more then must it be indifferent to those processes by which they are discovered" (p. 38). A coarser caricature could hardly be drawn. The vain and passionate Alcibiades flattered and cajoled by the artful Lyce into giving her a new shawl, and the two standing as representatives of that truth-loving spirit which sincere men have thought the only human test of truth itself! The spirit of truth is not "indifferent to the processes;" they are, on the contrary, all-important in its view; and if the processes are morally right, it righteously trusts that the results will be intellectually as well as morally true to the extent of individual capacity. A Heathen philosopher would not thus have disgraced himself, or so degraded his subject. But Mr. Kingsley, passing on from Lyce, presently makes a man "blow his nose by the spirit of truth," and "a horse shy at a beggar by the spirit of truth;" and at last proves this spirit of truth to be "something quite brutish and doggish, and proper to be restrained." When Alcibiades is gone, Phaethon beautifully says,

"'Oh Socrates, what cruel words are these which you have spoken? Are you not ashamed to talk thus contemptuously to one like me, even though he be younger and less cunning in argument than yourself; knowing as you do, how, when I might have grown rich in my native city of Rhodes, and marrying there, as my father purposed, a wealthy merchant's heiress, so have passed my life delicately, receiving the profits of many ships and warehouses, I yet preferred Truth beyond riches; and leaving my father's house, came to Athens in search of wisdom, dissipating my patrimony upon one sophist after another, listening greedily to Hippias, and Polus, and Gorgias, and Protagoras, and last of all to you, hard-hearted man that you are? For from my youth I loved and longed after nothing so much as Truth, whatsoever it may be; thinking

nothing so noble as to know that which is Right, and knowing it, to do it. And that longing, or love of mine, which is what I suppose Protagoras meant by the spirit of truth, I cherished as the fairest and most divine possession, and that for which alone it was worth while to live. For it seemed to me, that even if in my search I never attained to truth, still it were better to die seeking, than not to seek; and that even if acting by what I considered to be the spirit of truth, and doing honestly in every case that which seemed right, I should often, acting on a false conviction, offend in ignorance against the absolute righteousness of the Gods, yet that such an offence was deserving, if not of praise for its sincerity, yet at least of pity and forgiveness; but by no means to be classed, as you class it, with the appetites of brutes; much less to be threatened, as you threaten it, with infinite and eternal misery by I know not what necessary laws of Zeus, and to be put off at last with some myth or other about Prometheus. Surely your mother bare you a scoffer and pitiless, Socrates, and not, as you boast, a man-midwife fit for fair youths."—Pp. 51, 52.

But our loose thinker can unthink all this. Socrates, after this even, is the brute to quirk and quibble still, to the effect that if Phaethon "had possessed the spirit of truth, he would have seen *all facts whatever*, as they are;" and it turns out at last that, *instead of his possessing it*, it is desirable that *it should possess him!* and he is to pray the gods to give it him! But by what spirit will he do this, except the spirit of truth? Here is the stupid controversy of human impotence and divine grace virtually foisted into a Socratic dialogue. Socrates says the spirit of truth is not a part of you, but utterly independent of you. Is this spirit, then, always given or gained in one definite (or rather in an infinite) degree? Does every one who has it see all facts as they are? Or do not men grow in grace by effort; and does not God give more grace to the humble seekers after it? Does not the love of truth and the loving pursuit of it increase the power of gaining it? Sad word-splitting is this Socratic dialogue, after all!

The modern orthodox dogma of infinite sin, as committed against an infinite Being, though by a finite creature, is actually stretched and made to apply to mistakes of opinion, and poor dear Socrates is made to propound it like a Calvinistic divine meddling beyond his articles:

"But can we say of such mistakes, and of the harm which may accrue from them, anything but that they must both be infinite; seeing that they are mistakes concerning an infinite Being and his infinite properties, on every one of which, and on all together, our daily existence depends?"

Surely, Socrates never perplexed his clear head with such an argument. As truth is beneficent, of course error is injurious; but who shall talk of *infinite harm* from the partial ignorance or mistakes of human minds, and forget to ascribe *infinite reward and blessing* to its partial knowledge of truth? And then the

*infinite opposites* shew the folly of using such language at all, in respect either to our knowledge or to our ignorance.

There is a set of allusions prevalent through these Loose Thoughts, which, if classical and graceful in their place, and appropriate to Socrates and his Greek disciples, seem hardly decent in Christian Theology. The "Nymphs obtaining the embraces of the Gods by pleasing and obeying them in all things," are deemed the most appropriate "myth" for setting forth the "blessedness" of him who has "light to see facts as they are." And this myth is to replace such obsolete ideas as "the love of truth," "fidelity to conscience," "personal conviction," "individual judgment"! We think not. We think our Protestantism, whether as an *objective* fact in the world, or as the *subjective* experience of three centuries, will defy all pseudo-Socratic argument to prove, on the one hand, the attainableness of absolute infallible truth, or, on the other, to disprove the value and sanctity of individual faithfulness to individual convictions.

We have not alluded to the structure and style of the Phæthon. It is plainly the work of a fine classical scholar and man of genius. We have confined ourselves to the thoughts, avowedly loose, and have reprobated them as so. Except as the thoughts do injustice to the principal speaker, it is a clever imitation of the Platonic dialogue;—but these exceptions have become the rule by which we are led to condemn it even as a work of art, instead of mere drawbacks upon our admiration. The thoughts constitute the style.

E. H. II.

#### ON THE LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

THE language of History is easily translated, and needs little remark: the actions and the things named are nearly the same at all times; a horse, a camp, a general, a battle, a sword, find words in all languages. But it is far otherwise with our philosophical thoughts and religious feelings. The words which express these in one age of the world, are not easily understood in another. They must be explained by the help of the known opinions of the people who have used them and adapted them to their wants. The simple language of the Gospels, which speak to the heart, which describe the Saviour's life and acts of mercy, is more easily understood by everybody, than the philosophical arguments of the apostle Paul, which have often been wrested by the unlearned to the defence of opinions which the apostle never held. But even in the simplest parts of a book written

eighteen centuries ago, there are many words which a translation leaves obscure, and which require the help of a commentator.

The word God, which is now always pronounced with reverence as the proper name for the Creator, had, eighteen hundred years ago, been used among nations of polytheists, for Jupiter and Juno, for Osiris, for Baal, for statues and sacred animals, for kings and their favourites. When the Greeks of Egypt or Syria called Ptolemy or Antiochus a god, they never for a moment supposed that he had any share in creating or governing the world. The word bore no such lofty meaning. Moreover, it was a common name, not a proper name. To speak of the Almighty, it was necessary to say The God. Thus Paul did not write (Rom. ix. 5), "He that is over all, namely God, be blessed for ever," but "He that is God over all." Jehovah, on the other hand, was a proper name, and a word free from misunderstanding. But then it was a word too sacred to be written in Greek letters: it finds no place in the New Testament, or in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament. The word used in its place is Lord, and more often as a proper name, and therefore not The Lord, as we are obliged to write it in English. Thus, while the word Lord is used in some places as a mere title of civility to a centurion or a nobleman, it is in other places used as a proper name in a sense more solemn even than God.

Sometimes the Jewish reverential custom of not writing or speaking the name of Jehovah, leaves the meaning doubtful. Thus, in Coloss. i. 19, "For He was well pleased that in him all fulness should dwell;" meaning God was well pleased. Again, in Heb. iii. 5, "Moses truly was faithful in all His house;" meaning God's house. Sometimes, in order to avoid speaking of Jehovah too lightly, they say the Spirit of Jehovah, or the Holy Spirit, when they simply mean Jehovah himself; though at other times the Spirit means God's influence on the hearts of men.

The word which we render Worship is applied not only to God, but also to any men of rank; as, "The slave, falling down, worshiped him" (Matt. xviii. 26). The word which is more solemn and is applied only to God, is to Serve or perform religious service; as, "God, whom I serve in my spirit" (Rom. i. 9); and again, "They shall serve me in this place" (Acts vii. 7).

Good feeling has led all nations to speak to inferiors as youthful, to call servants lads, boys or maidens; and thus a word which in the time of Homer meant a Son, in the New Testament and Septuagint means a Servant. In Acts iv. 25, 27, we meet with "Thy servant David," and "Thy holy servant Jesus."

Many words by use gain a meaning more limited and more particular than they at first bore. Thus the Jews had such strong national feelings, that their word Nations means Foreign Nations, and we leave it untranslated—the Heathen, or the

Gentiles. So Paul (in 1 Cor. xiv.), speaking of a Language, means a foreign language. Since the conquest of Judea by the Assyrians, the Jews had been very much scattered among the neighbouring nations, but never lost their love of home. The word Dispersion thereby gained a peculiar meaning; and Peter, writing to his countrymen abroad, calls them the Pilgrims of the Dispersion (1 Peter i. 1). James also writes to the twelve tribes in the Dispersion.

Words which have two meanings in the same sentence, can seldom be properly translated. Thus, in John iii. 8, we have one word meaning both Wind and Spirit. In Mark viii. 35, 37, we have a word meaning both Life and Soul. In Hebrews ix. 15, 20, we have a word meaning both Testament and Covenant. In each of these cases the argument rests on the ambiguity of the word, and is lost in a translation. It must be left to the commentator to explain them.

Even the very simple words, Greeks, Jews and Hebrews, are not without two meanings each. The apostle Paul, by Greeks, often means all who are not Jews; as, "There is no difference between Jew and Greek" (Rom. x. 12). By Jews, Paul means all who were of the Jewish religion; but the apostle John means natives of Judea only. By the word Hebrews, the writer of the Acts (chap. vi. 1) means those only who spoke Hebrew; while he calls the Jews who spoke Greek, Grecians or Hellenists. On the other hand, the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews means to address all of the Jewish faith; but he certainly wrote in Greek; and, though he calls his readers Hebrews, he did not write for the use of those who used the Hebrew language.

The Jews of all sects had a strong belief that the age of the world in which they were then living was drawing to a close. Whether the end of the age was to arrive sooner or later—whether it was to be followed by the day of judgment, or by the destruction of the world, or by the beginning of a new age, they were not agreed. But so strong was this belief, that it appears in their religious language; and when a writer says that anything will last till the end of the age, he leaves us in doubt whether he means for ever, or for a short and fixed period of time. The words, "So will it be in the end of this age" (Matt. xiii. 40), refer to the day of judgment. "He hath no forgiveness till the end of the age" (Mark iii. 29), may mean for ever. Paul (1 Tim. i. 17), to make it clear that he means for ever, says, "Honour and glory for ages of ages." When the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says (chap. i. 2), that God through Jesus made the Ages, he is using language not unlike that of some of the Gnostics, who said that the *Æons* or Ages were spiritual beings that proceeded out of the everlasting God, and to whom he trusted the government of the world. See Theodoret. Heret., ii.

It would be more satisfactory if a Greek word could, wherever it is met with, be translated into the same English word; but this is often impossible, as it may have several distinct meanings. Thus we have one Greek word which seems to mean messenger, angel, ghost, and preacher, as in the following sentences. In Luke vii. 24, we have, "And when John's messengers were gone, he began to say." In Acts v. 19, we find, "An angel of the Lord by night opened the prison doors." In Acts xii. 15, when Peter appeared at home, while he was thought to be at a distance in prison, we have, "Then they said, It is his ghost;" and in 2 Tim. iii. 16, we have, "made manifest in flesh, justified in spirit, seen by preachers, proclaimed among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up in glory." In these four quotations we find four English words in the place of one Greek word. So also the word translated Prophet, generally means a man gifted with the power of foretelling future events, as in Matt. xxvi. 56: "All this hath been done, that the writings of the Prophet might be fulfilled." But this word sometimes means a man who has the power of extempore speaking, as in Acts xiii. 1: "Now there were at Antioch, in the church there, certain prophets and teachers, as Barnabas, and Simeon who was called Niger, and Lucius of Cyrene, and Manaen the schoolfellow of Herod the tetrarch, and Saul."

The writers suppose their Jewish readers to have a most thorough knowledge of the Old Testament. They quote it without naming it, knowing that the words of the oracle would be at once recognized and bowed to. Thus—"For he must reign till *he hath put all enemies under his feet*," says the apostle (1 Cor. xv. 25). "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, *they sacrifice to demons, not to gods*" (1 Cor. x. 20). "For *who hath known the mind of the Lord?*" (Rom. xi. 34). "For *all flesh is as grass*" (1 Peter i. 24). In every case, the writer quotes the Old Testament without saying so.

The references to the prophecies of the Old Testament are not only to the sense, but usually to the exact words. Thus Jesus is called THE CHRIST, or THE ANOINTED, because they applied to him the following words from Isaiah: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me; because he hath Anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor" (Luke iv. 18). So, when the Baptist says he is not the Christ, he is asked, "What then, art thou Elijah?" (John i. 21), referring to the words of Malachi: "Behold, I will send you Elijah, the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." The next question is, "Art thou the Prophet?" referring to the words of Deuteronomy, "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from among thy brethren" (see Acts iii. 22, and vii. 37). But the Baptist, quoting Isaiah, says, "I am, *the voice of one crying in the desert*." When the Saviour says that "John was the Lamp that burneth and shineth"

(John v. 35), he probably refers to Isaiah lxii. 1: "I will not rest until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth." The title given to Jesus of the Son of Man is probably taken from the prophet Ezekiel, who uses it throughout. Afterwards, it was stamped with still more importance, in Daniel vii. 13: "Behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven."

But the practice of referring to the words of the prophets, has in one or two cases led the writers to overlook the sense. Thus Matt. ii. 23: "He dwelt in a city called Nazareth; so that it might be fulfilled which was spoken through the prophets, He will be called a Nazarite," referring to Judges xiii. Here, the writer of this chapter mistakes a Nazarite, or man under a vow, for a Nazarene, or native of Nazareth. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews quotes from the Psalm, "What is man, that Thou art mindful of him; or the son of man, that Thou visitest him?"—as if the words son of man could there mean Jesus, or indeed any one man in particular.

Sometimes the quotation is so short that it must be misunderstood by an unlearned reader. Thus John (xii. 40) quotes from Isaiah, "He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts." But those who remember the words in the Old Testament, know that they are wholly different in meaning; namely, "This people hath blinded their own eyes and hardened their own hearts."

The quotations are usually taken from the Greek translation, called the Septuagint. When the writer to the Hebrews quotes a text, as if about the nature of angels, "Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire,"—his argument would have been spoiled if he had quoted from the Hebrew—"Who maketh the winds his messengers, and the lightnings his servants." When Paul says that the Law was 430 years after the Covenant (Gal. iii. 17), he is quoting the Septuagint, which says that there were 430 years between Abraham and Moses (Exodus xii. 40); not the Hebrew Bible, which says that there were 430 years between Joseph and Moses.

One Hebrew mode of expression is often a cause of ambiguity; namely, placing two clauses in a sentence as if they were parallel, whereas one is in reality dependent on the other. Thus, "Be angry, and sin not" (Ephes. iv. 26), means, If ye be angry, then sin not. Again: "I thank Thee, O Father, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes" (Matt. xi. 25), means, Because, whereas Thou hast hid these things, &c. Again: "But thanks be to God that ye were the slaves of sin, but have obeyed from the heart" (Rom. vi. 17), means, that whereas ye were the slaves of sin, &c.

These few remarks are perhaps enough to shew, that after the difficulties of translation have been overcome, there still remain a large number of words and sentences which ask for help from

critical skill. They shew that though no learning is necessary when we read the New Testament for purposes of devotion and as a guide towards our duties, yet that the unlearned will not do right to quote it in theological controversy without help from a commentator.

S. S.

---

#### NIEBUHR'S LIFE AND LETTERS.\*

IN the Preface to the first two volumes of this work, Miss Winkworth promised that, if these were favourably received, she would give another volume, containing some of Niebuhr's correspondence on subjects political and learned. Having met with an appreciation and acceptance such as few even original writers enjoy, it was to be expected that the translator would early redeem her promise, and she has done so in the volume before us. It is seldom, perhaps, that a supplementary gleanings equals in interest the first harvest, and we think this volume is no exception to the general rule. The most obvious cause of this is, that the first selection has been so well made, that the best and most genial of the letters have been already given, and have raised expectations which none that were left could satisfy. Even on politics and philology, Niebuhr's most striking opinions have been given, so that even these departments, which should supply the chief interest of this third volume, have been, so to speak, rifled of their most attractive treasures. Another reason is, that the former correspondence, being arranged in chronological order and embracing every period of the career of the gifted writer, presented a connected picture of his whole life, and had almost the charm of an autobiography; whereas here both the serial connection and the colouring of individuality are wanting. But there is, in spite of this, much that is highly interesting and valuable, and that bears the stamp of the same profound and patriotic mind which was displayed in its more domestic and attractive aspects in the former volumes.

This third volume is divided into three sections. The first is a statement of Niebuhr's general political creed, in the form of a letter from Chevalier Bunsen to the translator: the second is a collection of letters written from Holland in 1808 and 1809: the third consists of political and miscellaneous fragments from occasional and minor writings of Niebuhr.

We have seen in the earlier volumes in how extraordinary a degree there were united in Niebuhr the qualifications of both the statesman and the scholar; so that he achieved in both capa-

---

\* *Life and Letters of Barthold George Niebuhr.* Edited and Translated by Susanna Winkworth. Vol. III. Supplementary.

cities a position of the highest eminence in a period of immense political activity. Especially remarkable were his marvellous grasp of memory, which enabled him to retain without effort all the materials for the philosophical historian which past ages have supplied, and his almost intuitive sagacity, which taught him, on the one hand, to fill up and restore the lost threads of the web of ancient history, and, on the other, to divine with prophetic confidence the texture which the future would assume. The political opinions of a man thus gifted claim more than ordinary attention; and Miss Winkworth has done well to obtain from Bunsen, his chosen disciple and friend, the account of them here given. They refer principally to a subject which the events of the last four years have shewn to occupy the minds and wishes of advanced and liberal men on the continent, and which to us, as the only nation that has as yet permanently realized it, is of paramount interest, viz., constitutional government. The attention of Niebuhr was earnestly directed to the constitutional experiment then going on in France under the elder Bourbons; the failure of which, through the bigotry and treachery of Charles X., was the last great event he lived to see.

Most truly is it remarked by Bunsen, that "we live in a critical epoch of the world, when no mortal can yet tell whether Europe is advancing to life or sinking to death; whether the elements of decay or those of new life are the real signs of the times." The nations of the continent, which four years ago fondly believed that liberty was in their grasp, are drifting to a confirmed and soulless despotism, under which no free thought or action of humanity can develop itself and live. Is there anything that can save them from this fate? Republicanism seems too hazardous, and has too often been the precursor of military despotism, to be regarded with much hope by any real well-wisher of continental freedom. And if these now crushed and groaning nations are ever to realize their visions of constitutional liberty, what are to be the preliminary conditions? This question had been deeply considered by Niebuhr; and his views, formed perhaps half a century ago, have been but too well confirmed by the recent failure of constitutional government in Germany.

"Europe is threatened with great dangers, and with the loss of all that is noble and great, by two opposite but conspiring elements of destruction—despotism and revolution; both in their most mischievous forms. As to the former, the modern state despotism, established by Louis XIV., promoted by the French revolution, and carried out to unenviable perfection by Napoleon and those Governments which have adopted his system after combating its author,—is more enslaving and deadening than any preceding form; for it is civilized and systematized, and has, besides the military force, two engines unknown to the ancient world or to the middle ages. These are, first, the modern state-govern-

ment, founded upon a police-force which has degenerated into a gigantic spy-system; and, secondly, a thoroughly organized and centralized bureaucracy, which allows of no independent will and action in the country. So likewise modern revolution is more destructive of political life and the elements of liberty than similar movements in former ages; for it is a merely negative, and at the same time systematic, reaction against the *ancien régime*, of which it made the despotic part universal by carrying out uniformity, and by autocratic interference in the name of the State; whereas it gives no equivalent for the real, although imperfect, liberties which the old system contained, in the form of privileges; and in condemning such privileges under the sanction of democracy, it destroyed the basis of liberty under the pretext of sovereignty." P. xxiv.

Niebuhr did not consider that the establishment of parliaments *per se* was any guarantee for popular liberty: parliamentary government must be preceded by free local and municipal government.

"Constitutional monarchy was to him not the beginning but the end, not the root but the ripened fruit of the tree of liberty. In his view, the foundation of political liberty was municipal self-government, or, as he used to call it, a free administration,—'*freie Verwaltung*.' Without that basis, the legislative power of Parliament itself was to him either a *mauvaise plaisanterie*, or a mischievous experiment.

"Here we are arrived at the centre of Niebuhr's constitutional policy. Here is the pivot of his political system. He thought it as absurd and mischievous to begin with the parliamentary system (like the French revolution and all its imitators), as to create, or rather to restore self-government in Europe, while stopping short of constitutional liberty. The first error appeared to him as if a man should plant a tree without a root, while the second was like expecting it to bear fruit without being allowed to blossom; or he might have compared the one system to the mad endeavour to begin a house by the roof, whereas the other was as wise as to build a dwelling-house with a good foundation, but neglect to roof it in due time, and then to wonder and complain that the inhabitants did not feel comfortable!

"All his political conversations with me, when treating the constitutional question, turned upon this point. He often expressed to me his regret that the spirit of the age and the plan of his great work had made Montesquieu consider the parliamentary system isolated from its basis—municipal liberty and self-government. 'Montesquieu,' he once said, 'knew that well; but it is the tragical fate of great men that the defects or weak points of their system are made their principal merit or strong side, whereas the best things they say remain a dead letter.' He applied this in particular to the theory of the division of powers. 'Montesquieu's expression,' he said, 'is too abstract and absolute; but the French might as well have evolved out of it a good and wise system, as a vicious and foolish one. This arose out of the onesidedness and conceit of the men of 1789. Now the Empire,' he would continue, 'has done absolutely nothing but destroy a liberty which had neither a basis in the moral honesty of the people, nor in the practice of municipal self-government, and put in its place the most irresistible and destruc-

tive system of despotism which the world ever saw, covered with the lying colours of liberty and the rags of democracy!"—P. xxvii.

How truly do these severe words describe the worse than imitation of that Empire, which now lies like an incubus on the free life and thought of unhappy France! One formidable difficulty which constitutional government in that country will always have to contend with, is the influence of the Catholic Church, which was indeed a main cause of its failure in 1830. The following anecdote, related by Bunsen, is significant as well as amusing:

"When, in the summer of 1829, Pius VIII. had been elected successor to Leo XII., the Cardinal's hat was given to Latil, formerly, as Abbé Latil, the Confessor of the Comte d'Artois and of his mistress—later, as Archbishop of Rheims, the prelate who anointed Charles X. Diplomatic dinners preceded and followed this great ceremony. At a dinner given on this occasion at the Russian embassy, the Cardinal, after a joyous repast, entered into a private conversation with Prince Gagarin, the Russian Minister, with the import of which the Prince, who was '*homme désprit*' and very fond of fun, made me acquainted on the spot. The Cardinal had said to him, 'Prince, we'—meaning the King and the Cardinal, or the Cardinal and the King—'have come to the conclusion that two things are incompatible—the Catholic Church and the constitutional Charter. *We* see that we must choose between them, and our option has been made. You will believe me, Prince, that it has not been difficult. You will soon hear more of it. We must modify the Charter in order to make it compatible with the precepts of the Catholic Church; and we are decided to do so soon.' We both agreed that this was a most important revelation, and that vanity and wine had made Latil say more than a confessor and a Cardinal ought to have divulged. The manner in which he had said these words was such, that it was impossible not to believe that he spoke the secret of the Cabinet. And indeed when, a few days afterwards, he received, under a princely dais, the red hat from the Pope's Alegate, instead of answering his congratulations, as other cardinals used to do, with a few words of thanks, he made a set speech, evidently learnt by heart, and delivered with great emphasis, in which he said—'Tell the Holy Father that I am fully aware of the duties and responsibilities which this highest honour imposes upon me in the situation which I hold. My conduct will shew my sense of duty and my gratitude.'"—P. xxxv.

Few men have had better opportunities of knowing the spirit and policy of the Romish Church, than Niebuhr and Bunsen, who both resided for years, officially, in the metropolis of Romanism; and few men could be found less liable to form opinions on hasty or illiberal grounds; yet they do not hesitate to pronounce the clergy the ever obedient tools of despotism, and "the mortal enemies of every sort of liberty and progress."

It is unnecessary to follow Chevalier Bunsen further in this letter, the remainder of which is taken up principally in describing the mode in which Niebuhr proposed to apply the constitutional system to the actual circumstances and social state of

Prussia. But one passage from the third or miscellaneous division of the volume we will give here, as it bears on a point which we have sometimes heard urged as an objection to constitutional government, viz., that no reform appears practicable under it unless preceded by popular agitation. How much better, say some, if the government, less dependent on the stimulus from without, were able of itself to effect important reforms, removing by its own authority the opposition of selfish and interested parties, and saving its citizens the wearing and bitter struggles of party agitation, which seem sometimes almost to threaten a rupture of the social fabric! But even granting that violent agitation is an evil, there is in it, independent of its utility as a school for the exercise of political rights, one important advantage, thus well stated by Niebuhr:

“It is the peculiar and inimitable excellence of the British legislation that no law can anticipate the progress of public opinion. Thus the laws find the way prepared for them, and millions are eager to carry them into execution; thus they do not come before the public as a dead mass of words which study alone can render intelligible, but the public is already awaiting them, and comes to meet them half-way. This method certainly makes it necessary, in the case of all great measures, that the majority of the people should be brought to concur in their favour; and a generation may elapse before the prejudices of the majority can be silenced. But if this have been accomplished, and a strong feeling on the side of the new measures been formed, it is no longer in the power of the administration, as is proved in the case of the Catholics, to resist the force of public opinion. Those men who are free from prejudice, will unquestionably discern what is desirable or expedient sooner than the multitude, which cleaves more closely to its old customs; and the freer the nation, the stronger are its prejudices. But if the clearer vision of the more sagacious minority become law ere it is called for by the general voice, it takes the shape of external restraint, and does not mingle with the deep-rooted national habits.”—P. 111.

The Letters from Holland, which form the next division of the volume, were written in 1808 and 1809, whilst Niebuhr was staying in that country, endeavouring to obtain financial assistance for Prussia at that disastrous period of her history. His mission brought him into connection with the great bankers and merchants of Amsterdam, and among others with the English house of Hope, of whom he speaks as the most eminent of these merchant princes. The society of the Dutch capital he describes as dull and frivolous, the chief or rather sole occupation at evening parties being cards. Niebuhr, who had not acquired the taste for gambling, was much diverted at the contempt with which he was regarded in consequence. In one of these letters he says,

“I did not get home till two o'clock this morning from a supper at Mr. Hope's. At this party one thing afforded me much amusement. Here, it is never imagined that any human being having claims to the

title, does not gamble; it is therefore a rule in Amsterdam, that the number of persons at an evening party should, subtracting seven, be divisible by four into the intended number of parties for cards. These seven are destined for *bouillotte*. Now, Amelia remained at home, and I did not play. This deranged the whole plan of those who had grouped together for this interesting amusement, and they were forced to play with only five. What a malicious pleasure I enjoyed in watching the vexation of one and another at this spoiling of the only interesting hour of their day; above all, the excessively supercilious contempt with which a *petite maitresse* regarded me for my awkwardness and want of education! I enjoyed it so much that it made the evening quite endurable. A Huron (a character in one of Voltaire's novels) would have said of Amsterdam, 'They invite a stranger, under pain of their considering themselves highly insulted, to spend his evening after nine o'clock in utter idleness, and to undergo a headache, if night-watching does not agree with him. They also impose it on him as a duty to lose either his money or his temper at play. This is one of the refinements by which intellectual culture has been brought to its well-known high perfection in Europe.'" P. 9.

These letters, having been written for the perusal of his relations in Holstein, contain fewer of the personal characteristics or important opinions of the writer, than those of the former volume. They are the narrative of a tourist, and are principally taken up with descriptions of his visits to the various cities and public institutions of the country, churches, galleries, hospitals and other charitable institutions, in which latter, most admirably conducted, Holland abounds. The large houses for the reception of orphans are under the superintendence of directors and directresses, chosen from the highest class of citizens, whose services are given gratuitously. The resident overseers are called Fathers and Mothers, and the treatment of the inmates seems at once liberal and judicious. Niebuhr visited the Citizens' Orphan House, containing from 600 to 700 children.

"This is quite a model institution, managed on the system I have just described. None but the orphans of citizens of Amsterdam are received into it. They remain till they have completed their 20th year, and are instructed, the girls in women's employments, the boys in handicrafts or navigation, besides the usual school education. They are allowed to learn anything except locksmiths' work, which is not taught lest they should be tempted to break open each other's chests: for each child has its own chest, with its own number and key, for the clothes and little things it has brought with it. We have only seen the part of the building containing the girls and the little boys, and I could never have thought that an Orphan House could present so cheerful a spectacle. When we came in, the bigger girls were sitting working in the handsome wide court-yards; the little ones were playing as merrily as if they had been in their own homes. During the interval that we had passed in the directors' rooms, the little ones had taken their supper; and as we went up stairs to their dormitories—where we were not less delighted with the fresh, pure air than with the neatness and cleanliness

of their beds—came the hour for going to bed, and the whole stream rushed up the staircase with us. The little creatures were not at all shy, and were continually laughing at my spectacles. How I wish our Christine could have seen this sight! They are allowed to go out at certain times; for just as the ‘Mothers’ seem to exercise a truly maternal care over them, so they are not more confined than order requires, or than they would be in the house of good parents. Here again we see the sound, excellent, old Dutch intelligence. So Howard is said to have declared, that the wisdom of the founders astonished him almost more than the number of benevolent contributors.”—P. 45.

We will close our notice with a few extracts from the Political and Miscellaneous fragments, which form the third section of the book. The first shall be from a paper on International Rights.

“War and victory are only means of enforcing right; they create no right which did not exist before. An unjust victory and the conditions of peace extorted by it are, and remain to eternity, illegal, except in so far as the maintenance of the existing universal political relations may render their acknowledgment and observance the lesser of two evils. Thus the cessions and treaties extorted by France under Napoleon were illegal; and as it was a duty to God and man to annihilate the order of things introduced by them, so they neither superseded existing rights nor created new ones. Hence we are not speaking of any rights which the Allies have acquired by conquest, but of rights which their conquests rendered capable of being enforced; and we protest against censures proceeding from a dishonest confounding of these two things. He who combats for the right and against the wrong, conquers, when victorious, whatever would be awarded to him by a tribunal not bound to the letter: for he has overstepped the domain of the letter, which reigns within the sphere of positive law. But from the necessity of extorting your rights springs a twofold right, that of indemnifying yourself for your losses and toils, and that of providing for your future security, lest the enemy from whom you have wrung justice should take advantage of a favourable opportunity to revenge himself. Where the ground of warfare is not a contested right, but a mortal enmity, there arise between governments, as in antiquity between peoples, wars of extermination, resembling a struggle for life and death between man and man. The extent of a victor's lawful powers cannot be determined by any letter; they can only be referred to the tribunal of conscience.”—P. 120.

In this miscellaneous section there are several valuable fragments relating to ancient literature and history—“On Marcus Antoninus and his Age;” “On Petronius and his Age;” “On Xenophon's Hellenics, and the Character of Xenophon and Plato.” There is also a sketch of the growth and decay of the city of Rome, intended as an introduction to the description of Rome by Plattner and Bunsen. There is an excellent essay “On the Study of Antiquities,” being an introduction to his lectures on that subject; in which, among other things, he shews the absurdity of an overweening and almost unreasoning reverence for the classical writers, which led men to receive their

evidence, even on points and events which belonged to times long anterior to themselves, as entitled to absolute credit. To even the best ancient historians, the antiquities of their own nation were probably much less known than our own antiquities to us; and how imperfectly that is, the controversies and the Notes and Queries of our own day sufficiently shew.

"It would have been a very surprising thing if Sallust or Tacitus had known more of the Roman jurisprudence, 500 years before their time, than a British statesman that of his own country at a proportionately remote period. Nobody would expect anything else, were it not that the long line of antiquity is to our eyes so foreshortened, that very few practically realize that the time between Plautus and Claudian was as long as that from the Minnesingers to our own day. For the contemplation of antiquity is like looking up at mountain ranges rising up one behind another, of which the most remote and central peaks appear quite contiguous to the headlands at their base. Under the influence of this delusion, we shut our eyes to the evidence which meets the reader of those historians at every turn when they speak of old things and times, that all these were a foreign world to them. It is the same delusion which makes us persist in laying as much weight on Livy's or Cicero's verdicts respecting ancient times, as if pronounced by eye-witnesses and actors in the scene."—P. 222.

These extracts, which might be greatly extended, will be sufficient to indicate the solid and suggestive character of these fragments, and shew that, if this volume is not so attractive to the general reader as its predecessors, it abounds in matter that will richly repay perusal to those who seek in their reading something more than entertainment, and who delight in drawing exercise and food for their own thoughts and studies from the lucubrations, even though unfinished, of rarely-gifted minds.

The translator has performed her part with the same skill and freedom which we had occasion to commend in our former notice of her work. There are very few passages in which an English reader would discover that he was reading a translation; and this great merit, too, has been attained under the greater difficulties inseparable from the more learned and technical character of the pieces to be rendered, many of which are on contested points of philology or antiquities.

B.

#### THE SCEPTICAL PHILOSOPHERS OF GREECE.

THE Genius of Greece fell with Liberty. The Grecian philosophy received its mortal wound in the contests between scepticism and dogmatism which occupied the schools in the age of Cicero. The sceptics could only perplex and confute and destroy. Their occupation was gone as soon as they succeeded. They had nothing to substitute for what they overthrew; and they rendered their own art of no further use. They were no more than venomous animals, who stung their victims to death, but also breathed their last into the wound.—*Sir James Mackintosh's Miscellaneous Works*, I. 33.

## THE TESTIMONY OF JOSEPHUS CONCERNING CHRIST.\*

WE take up an old treatise, and a still older subject, not so much in the hope of bringing forward anything that is new on so well-discussed a topic, as simply with the purpose of re-stating a few of the considerations which may be urged in favour of the reception, as authentic, of an ancient testimony respecting the Founder of Christianity. In doing this, we shall make free use of such works on the subject as are within our reach. The literature relating to the question is voluminous. The principal writers will be found mentioned by Schoedel—not always correctly, however, as where he classes Dr. Lardner among those who have admitted the evidence of Josephus. They are referred to also, many of them, by Gieseler (*Eccles. Hist.* i. § 24), and given more fully by Heinichen (in his long and elaborate *Excursus* on *Euseb. Hist. Eccl.* i. 11). To Bretschneider (*Παρεργον* super *Ios. de I. C. testimonio*, and the more recent summary by the same author in his *Glaubenslehre*, § 42), as well as to the work which has furnished our text, we must acknowledge ourselves especially indebted. The section of Josephus on which so much has been written by these various authors, has lost none of its importance, in consequence of the controversies of late years on the origin and historical character of the Gospels. It is easy, on the contrary, to see that the fact of the authenticity and genuineness of the passage, if established, would have the most direct bearing on the question of the credibility of the Gospel History; and would go some way towards confirming their title to the character of fair and trustworthy records of the public life and teaching of Jesus.

Josephus, the celebrated Jewish historian, was born about the year 37 A.D.—that is, a few years after the crucifixion. He belonged to a priestly family of distinction, and received an education suitable to his descent and rank. Of the sect of the Pharisees, he was yet no bigoted adherent of that party; for he took pains to inform himself well respecting the doctrines of the Sadducees, and spent three years in the wilderness among the Essenes, whom he repeatedly mentions in terms of commendation. These facts are of some importance in helping us to estimate the passage in his works in which he speaks particularly of our Saviour. They shew us that he was not likely to be carried away by Pharisaic zeal and hatred of the Christians, and that he was a man who was capable of freeing himself from the common prejudices of his people,—an expectation that is verified by much in his writings. He was present at the destruction of Jerusalem, and some time after that occurrence went to Rome,

---

\* *Flavius Iosephus de Iesu Christo testatus Vindicie Flaviane Auctore F. H. Schoedel, &c. Pp. 84. Lipsiæ. MDCCCLX.*

where the remainder of his life was chiefly spent, under the protection of the imperial house and in intercourse with its members. Here he employed himself in the composition of his literary works, of which we need only mention his *History of the Jewish War*, and his work on the *Antiquities of the Jews*. In the latter, he gives an account of the origin and history of his nation, following in this the narratives of the Old Testament, but frequently in so free a manner as to indicate his own doubt or rejection of some of the statements there made. He brings down this work to the commencement of the last war of the Jews with the Romans, and completed it about the year A.D. 93. His main object, in its composition, appears to have been to gain for his nation the good opinion of the Romans, and to exhibit the value and wisdom of the Mosaic legislation.

Now, as the *Antiquities* comes down to a point so many years after the death of Christ (A.D. 66), and includes the period of his public life, it would indeed be strange if there should be found in that work no notice of the origin of the sect of the Nazarenes, of the fate of its Founder, or of the very considerable progress which, at the time when the *Antiquities* was finished, had been made by the adherents of Jesus. In his position at Rome, the historian could hardly fail to meet with disciples, among whom were probably some members of the imperial household (comp. Philip. iv. 22). We cannot see any reasonable ground for expecting that such an omission on the part of Josephus should be made. It may be said, indeed, that his prejudices as a Jew and a Pharisee, his zeal for the religion of his fathers, would lead him to dislike the Christians; and, since any true account he might give of their origin and character would tend rather to benefit them than otherwise, his best policy was to pass them over in silence.\* But is there any sufficient evidence of the prejudices and zeal here referred to,—such as would lead to this contemptuous treatment of what, in the latter years of the life of the historian, must have been a sect rapidly growing into importance? We think not, but the contrary; and we have already alluded to the grounds on which this opinion may be based. From the circumstances of his later years, Josephus was, probably, as much a Gentile and a Roman as a Jew; as any one may perceive who will take the trouble to read the account of his life. By his own countrymen he was regarded as little better than a renegade. Besides this, we must not lose sight of a fact of importance. At the time the *Antiquities* was written, the active hostility of the Jewish authorities towards the Christian apostles and disciples had well nigh ceased. The latter had

---

\* Comp. Lardner, Works, VI. p. 500, and the passage there quoted from Le Clerc, who calls Josephus "ce Juif malicieux," on account of his supposed silence about the Christians.

turned themselves, in truth, to other countries and peoples; and the former, after the destruction of Jerusalem, can hardly have had any longer even an existence. Thus even supposing, what is probably not true, that Josephus was much under the influence of Pharisaic zeal, still it is not likely that such zeal should have been so stimulated by anything in the relations existing between the Jews and the Christians, about the time when he was writing the latter part of his work, as to lead him deliberately to suppress all allusion to the rising sect, or studiously to conceal his very knowledge of its origin and existence. That would have been a mode of shewing zeal, or prejudice, or whatever it may be termed, extraordinary and useless in a high degree. Moreover, it should be remembered, that a numerous party among the Christians were as zealous for the law as Josephus himself; and hence, again, the improbability that any strong feeling of dislike, or of contempt, should have been entertained by him towards them. Indifference to the Christians would be a more probable explanation; but even this can hardly be accepted as sufficient; for a writer of such extensive knowledge of his own times must have been well aware of the important progress which the new religion had made long before the completion of his History.

It is therefore, antecedently, probable enough that some notice of Christ and his followers would be taken by the Jewish historian;\* and, judging from his character, we may expect such a notice of them as, without giving minute details, will correspond tolerably well to the facts of the case. And such a notice is actually found in the extant works of Josephus. As we shall have to make some remarks on words and phrases in this passage, we give it below entire as it stands in the original,† adding here a tolerably close translation:—"At that time lived Jesus, a wise man, if, indeed, it is proper to call him a man; for he was a doer of wonderful deeds, a teacher of men who receive with pleasure what is true. And he drew to him many Jews, and many also of the Greek race. This was the Christ. And when Pilate, on the accusation of the chief men among us, had condemned him to the cross, those who had before loved him did not cease (to do so). For he appeared to them on the third day

\* This is fully admitted by Heinichen, who writes:—"Debut adeo fere quædam Iosephus de Christo commemorare, cum de aliis longe levioribus rebus exposuerit, et Iohannis baptistæ et Iacobi Iusti mentionem fecerit Antiqq. xviii. 5, 2, xx. 9, 1." (Excur. I. p. 336.)

† Γίνεται δε κατά τουτον τον χρονον Ιησους, σοφος ανηρ, ειγε ανδρα αυτον λεγειν χρη. Ην γαρ παραδοξων εργων ποιητης, διδασκαλος ανθρωπων των ηδονη τάληθη δεχομενων. Και πολλους μεν Ιουδαιους, πολλους δε και του Έλληνικου επηγαγετο. Ό Χριστος ούτος ην. Και αυτον, ενδειξει των πρωτων ανδρων παρ' ήμιν, σταυρω επιτέμνηκτος Πιλατου, ουκ επανσαντο οι γε πρωτον αυτον αγαπησαντες. Εφανη γαρ αυτοις τριτην εχων ήμεραν παλιν ζων, των θειων προφητων ταυτα τε και αλλα μυρια θαυμασια περι αυτον ειρηκοτων. Εις επι νυν των χριστιανων, απο τουδε ωνομασμενων ουκ επελιπε το φυλον.—Antiqq. xviii. 3, 3.

alive again, the divine prophets having foretold these and many other wonderful things concerning him. Up to the present time the sect of the Christians, so named from him, has not become extinct."

This passage is found in every extant manuscript of Josephus. It is first quoted by Eusebius, who gives it nearly verbatim in two places,\* and probably alludes to it in one or two others. After him it is cited by Jerome and by successive writers, for a long period and without question, until we come to the sixteenth century, when it was doubted by one Hubert Gifanius and by Lucas Osiander. The section has been attacked and defended by various writers from that time to the present, when, we suppose, the preponderance of opinion may be taken to be as much as ever against its authority. Some have gone so far as to say that it was wholly composed by Eusebius; others, that it at least originated in his time, as Lardner thought; while others, again, maintain that it received its present form from the pen of this Father, having previously existed in a shorter form, as it came from the hand of Josephus,—which is the view taken by Heinichen and by Gieseler—the latter, however, not decidedly accusing Eusebius of the interpolation.

But why, we must proceed to inquire, should there be so much doubt and difficulty about this passage? Why should not Josephus have written it? Why must he receive the hard treatment of being first deprived of a section which actually exists in all the manuscripts and printed editions of his works, and then termed a "malicious Jew," because he has not the very notice of Christ and the Christians which this so rejected section contains? We cannot do better, perhaps, in endeavouring to give some answer to these questions, than state in order the objections brought by Dr. Lardner against the passage, taking them as they are derived, first, from its external history and its position, and, secondly, from its internal character.

The paragraph is not quoted, nor referred to, by any Christian writer before Eusebius, who flourished at the beginning of the fourth century, although we might expect that it would have been brought forward by Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and Origen, some or all of these. They were well acquainted with the works of Josephus, and it "would have been highly proper to produce it in their disputes with Jews and Gentiles." . . . . "A testimony so favourable to Jesus in the works of Josephus . . . . could not be overlooked or neglected by any Christian Apologist."†

Before we can attribute much weight to this objection, we must be tolerably clear on two points—first, that the several

\* *Demonst. Evang.* iii. 5. *Hist. Eccles.* i. 11.

† Lardner, *Works*, VI. p. 487, seq.

writers mentioned were well acquainted with the *Antiquities* of Josephus, and secondly, that they were likely to think his testimony respecting the life and character of Christ of such value as to deserve citation in their controversial writings. To take the latter point first, there is one general consideration, applicable perhaps equally to all the early Apologists, which will in itself go far to explain their omission to cite the statement under our notice, or even to shew us that they could not, with any propriety or force, appeal to Josephus as a witness in their behalf. He was not a *Christian*. This is now probably admitted by every one who has considered the question, if it has not always been so. We learn it not only from his works, but from the positive statement of Origen, if this were needed, which it is not. This being so, it is evident that the testimony respecting the character and deeds of Jesus, given by one who was not himself made a Christian by the admission of that testimony, could have but little weight with either Jewish or Gentile opponents. If Josephus could remain an unbeliever despite the statement respecting Christ which he makes, so evidently might they even in the face of the same statement. It would have been useless, therefore, to allege this evidence of the Jewish historian to the Hebrew or Heathen contemporaries of the first Apologists, and accordingly it is not mentioned. Even when Eusebius cites the passage, he lays little or no stress on it as confirmative of the statements of the Gospels. He expressly says in one case, that the evidence of the Evangelists is sufficient (*Demonst. Ev.* III. 5); and the use he makes of the quotation is to shew that many Greeks as well as Jews attached themselves to Jesus, which he observes is also stated in the Acts of the Apostles. In the other case (*Ecc. Hist.*, I. 11), the citation is certainly brought forward with more of an apologetical purpose, and has the appearance of being intended to confirm the statements of the Gospels; but even here it is not adduced with any air of triumph, or as if the writer attached any very great importance to it. And the same remark is true of the manner in which Jerome appeals to the passage (*De Vir. Illust.*, cap. xiii.). The slight use thus made of the paragraph by those who do cite it, helps to explain why the earlier Fathers made no appeal to it at all. It would have done them small service. In truth, in the first two or three centuries, the great facts of the life of Christ were hardly called in question. The miracles were admitted even by the adversaries of Christianity—attributed to the devil, it is true, or to magical arts, but still admitted, and therefore needing no attestation from Josephus. The Gospel history was well known and generally received, probably on the simple statement of the Christians. The formal exhibition of evidence, internal and external, and the citation of corroborative testimonies, with which we are so familiar in modern treatises, is not met with in the early Apolo-

gies. These are for the most part occupied with very different matter—such as the vindication of the Christians from gross calumnies; the defence of their doctrine of one God as having been recognized by ancient heathen philosophers and poets; the proof from the prophecies of the Old Testament that Jesus was the Messiah, and so forth;—facts which all serve to illustrate our general statement, that there was little occasion for any appeal to Josephus on the part of the early Fathers, and that there would have been little propriety or utility in any such application of his authority.

With respect more particularly to Justin Martyr, can it be alleged with any confidence that he was even acquainted with the works of Josephus? From the principal writings of this Father, the two Apologies and the Dialogue with Trypho, it would not appear that he was so, as no citation from Josephus occurs in them,—a fact which, at any rate, shews us how little use he was inclined to make of the authority of that historian. In one of the minor works attributed to Justin (the *Cohortatio ad Græcos*), Josephus is certainly mentioned as a wise and prudent man. But the authenticity of this work is doubtful;\* while, even assuming it, there appears to be no necessity or propriety in the nature of the contents for the citation of the passage. The Dialogue with Trypho is the work in which, more than in any other of Justin's, we should at first sight expect the disputed paragraph to be adduced or referred to. But the plan of this Dialogue appears to have been such as necessarily to exclude it. The whole argument is founded on an authority recognized as indisputable by both sides, viz., the Jewish Scriptures. To have cited as important the testimony of Josephus, would have been to have changed the character of the discussion, as a discussion founded in the Scriptures alone.† Even supposing, therefore, that Josephus really intended to admit that Jesus was the expected Messiah, his admission could have had no weight with the unbelieving Jew, but would be taken simply as the erroneous opinion of an individual. It is probable, also, that the ill-repute of Josephus among his own countrymen in the time of Justin, would effectually prevent the latter from bringing forward his testimony in any controversy with Jews. Thus the passage would be absolutely powerless to prove what the Father is seeking to establish, the Messiahship of Jesus: this was only to be conclusively shewn out of the Old Testament itself.

The remarks now made in regard to Justin, apply also, *mutatis mutandis*, to Irenæus. This Father does not refer to Josephus at all in the single work of his which we possess. Once

---

\* Neander, Church Hist. II. pp. 418, 419 (Bohn's ed.). Dict. of Greek and Rom. Biog. and Mythol., art. Justinus.

† Schoedel, p. 27, for passages from the Dialogue in proof of this.

only does he appear to do so, and that is in a short fragment attributed to him, and printed at the end of Grabe's edition (p. 472). No importance can be attached to this; and no conclusion against the paragraph can fairly be drawn from the silence of Irenæus, until it can be shewn both that the Antiquities were known to him, and that there was some necessity for his citation of the disputed passage.

With Clement of Alexandria, the case is somewhat different. This Father, who died about A.D. 218, was undoubtedly acquainted with the Antiquities; for he makes some use of chronological data which they contain, to determine the year and the day of the birth of Christ. In this instance, however, Clement would have had no assistance from a particular quotation of the words of Josephus respecting Christ, and we do not see how even a reference to them would have aided him. The paragraph says nothing about the birth of Jesus, or about his age, mentioning only the time at which he exercised his public ministry. Clement might very well consider the whole section as without weight for the information or confirmation of those who were already Christians; as may be alleged, indeed, with equal propriety respecting Irenæus. We must remember, again, in the case of these early writers, how near to the time of Christ they still were, and how little need there was that the well-known story of the Founder of Christianity should be confirmed by the quotation of a few lines from a Jewish author. For the conversion of unbelievers, indeed, but little use would seem to have been made at any time of the facts of the life of Jesus, taken by themselves alone, and as possessed of an extraordinary character. The great endeavour was rather to shew that they were conformable to ancient prediction. The facts themselves were there; rarely questioned by any one; requiring no attestation from any one; known to be true, because recorded in the Gospels, or handed down by oral delivery from and though those who were "witnesses of these things." To attempt, by historical testimony, to prove or attest facts thus already universally credited, was evidently a superfluous work.

These remarks apply equally to Tertullian, a contemporary of Clement of Alexandria. He was chiefly engaged in discussions with, and for, those who were already believers, whether heretical or not, and who required, therefore, no testimony from Josephus to create or to strengthen their faith. It will, perhaps, be difficult to mention any work of this celebrated Father, except, it may be, his *Liber adversus Judæos*, and his work *adv. Gentes*, in which the passage of Josephus could well have found a place; or at least any other work which, from not containing either the passage or a reference to it, can be regarded as furnishing a plausible argument against it. Tertullian was, no doubt, acquainted with Josephus, as his mention of him in the treatise

*adv. Gentes*, shews. It has, however, been thought that his designation of the Jewish historian as "*antiquitatum judaicarum vernaculus vindex*," indicates his acquaintance only with the work of Josephus against Apion. If so, it is at once apparent why he should not have made any quotation of a notice occurring in the *Antiquities*. But, even without thus restricting the knowledge of Tertullian, we do not see that his non-citation of the passage in this place is to be wondered at. With what propriety could it have been here introduced? The writer is speaking simply of the superior antiquity of the Jewish Scriptures, and not at all of the Christians or their affairs: and surely the words of Josephus were not to be paraded every time that a Christian writer happened to make any reference to that author, and whatever might be the nature or the purpose of such reference. Tertullian's book against the Jews might, however, so far as we can judge, easily and properly enough have contained the controverted passage. Why it is not in any way noticed there, we do not pretend particularly to explain. But, on the other hand, we may ask again, Can it be laid down as a rule, that every early Christian author who happens to mention Josephus must shew his acquaintance with this particular passage, otherwise its authenticity must be given up? Unless such a rule *can* be maintained, where is the reasonableness of rejecting the statement as an interpolation (or as interpolated), merely because Tertullian here fails to adduce it?

On the non-appearance of the disputed words in the works of Origen, much emphasis is laid by Dr. Lardner. He observes, "This passage is not only not quoted by Origen, but we can perceive that he had it not." The places in Origen on which this statement is founded are three, of which two occur in his work against Celsus, and one in his Commentary on Matthew.\* In these three instances, Origen represents Josephus as saying, that the sufferings of the Jewish people and the destruction of Jerusalem took place "in vindication of James," or "on account of James," or "for what they had dared to do to James, the brother of Jesus called the Christ;" whereas the Father, in the first two cases, adds, Josephus ought to have said † they happened because of Jesus himself. Before going further, we must observe that, in representing Josephus as thus speaking respecting James, Origen *misrepresents* him; as no such remark is to be found in his writings, as Dr. Lardner admits. Josephus in one place (*Antiq.* xviii. 5, 2) says, that some of the Jews thought the destruction of the army of Herod, in his expedition against Aretas, happened on account of the death of John the Baptist. It is most

---

\* Schoedel, pp. 31, 32, the passages of Origen are given at length. Comp. Lardner, VI. 488.

† *δὲον αὐτὸν εἰπεῖν*, κ. λ.

probable, strange as it may appear, that Origen, by a failure of memory, confounds the death of John and the loss of the army of Herod, with the death of James and the destruction of Jerusalem. But, to return to our main argument. In two of the passages of Origen just referred to, that Father expressly speaks of Josephus as "disbelieving in Jesus as Christ;" and again, as "not admitting our Jesus to be Christ."\* Here, then, is the alleged positive evidence that "Origen never read in Josephus that testimony to Jesus which we now have in his works." A very different conclusion may, however, with equal probability, be drawn from these statements of Origen. The latter evidently does not allege of Josephus that he is *silent* respecting Jesus, but that he does not mention his name rather than that of James. Josephus ought, according to Origen, to have ascribed the sufferings of the Jews to what they had done to *Jesus*. Then Josephus must have been well aware of what they had done to Jesus, and also of the life and the character of Jesus, as even a more righteous man than James. And Origen knew that Josephus was so, and could speak so positively on the point, because he was acquainted with what the historian says in the disputed passage respecting Jesus and the conduct of the Jewish rulers to him. Hence Origen may have read this very passage in Josephus; and we do not gather from what the Father states, that "he had it not," as Lardner infers, but the contrary, even that he had it!

In the passage in the Commentary on Matthew, Origen uses the words, "The wonderful thing is, that, not admitting our Jesus to be Christ, he not the less bore witness that the righteousness of James was so great."† Here the writer implies that Josephus is inconsistent in recognizing the remarkable righteousness of James, at the same time that he refused to receive Jesus as the Christ. It was properly due to the well-known righteousness of James, that Josephus should mention it: it was equally to be expected (according to Origen's implication) that Josephus, knowing the character and the life of Jesus as he did, should have received him as the Christ. It was wonderful, therefore, that, not having done the latter, he should yet so fully and remarkably have done the former. Hence, as before, to speak thus respecting the author of the Antiquities, Origen must have read in this work the very passage in dispute; and must have been sure, *from seeing it there*, that the writer of it was as well informed about Jesus as he was about James.

(To be continued.)

---

\* *ἀπιστων τῷ Ἰησοῦ ὡς χριστῷ* (Cont. Cels.); *τον Ἰησοῦν ἡμῶν ου καταδεξαμενος ειναι χριστον* (Com. ad Matt.).

† Το θαυμαστον εστιν, ὅτι τον Ἰησοῦν, κ. λ.

ADDRESS DELIVERED IN THE NEW MEETING-HOUSE, BIRMINGHAM, AT THE FUNERAL OF THE REV. JOHN KENTISH, ON TUESDAY, MARCH 15, 1853.

BY SAMUEL BACHE.

My Christian Friends and Fellow-mourners,—It is seldom indeed that we are called to follow to the silent tomb one more truly venerable, or more extensively revered, or more deeply lamented, than our departed friend. Not we alone, but the whole community, of which, for more than half a century, he has been a useful and distinguished member and a liberal benefactor, involuntarily confess that our loss is great as it is irreparable; and that his removal from us at last, though in the full maturity of a more than usually advanced and honourable age, is the withdrawal of one who, for this long series of years, has been eminently “a burning and a shining light.” Grateful, indeed, may we well be to the Providence who orders our lot, for having spared to us so long our beloved and venerated friend: grateful, too, that, ere the time arrived for his departure, we had (not less than himself, who needed it not, being always ready)—*we* had an impressive warning that he would soon be called from among us: grateful, too, that one so eminent as he was for mental power, activity, discrimination and culture, was not suffered to survive the decay of his intellectual vigour, but was so peacefully and so happily translated to the eternal rest, after having devoted the very last hour of his conscious sojourn here to the ever beloved and sacred offices of domestic worship, in the bosom of his family and within the hallowed precincts of his home. Our hearts are soothed and softened by the thought of his own tranquil and blessed removal, and of that very gradual progress of decline by which it was preceded. For himself, we thankfully own that we have nothing to regret, nothing to lament, nothing that we could have wished ordered otherwise than it has been ordered by Infinite Goodness and Mercy. But it is impossible for us to meet to pay the last sorrowing tribute of respectful and grateful love to his memory,—and this in the very house of worship in which, for more than forty years, his instructive counsels and affectionate exhortations have been heard, and to which, for more than fifty years, he has delighted regularly to come up in the society of his fellow-worshippers to conduct and share their devotions,—without recalling him to our thoughts with renewed veneration and gratitude, and with an unfeigned regret that we, among whom he has gone preaching the kingdom of God, not less by his Christian life than by his enlightened and liberal Christian conversation and discourse, shall see his face no more.

Yes, it is eminently the servant and apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ whose course of distinguished service in the ministry, which

in early youth he reverently received, we here see brought to its close! How faithful was he to that service! How honourably distinguished in it! With what dignity did he magnify his office! With what watchfulness and activity did he fulfil its obligations! How mighty was he in the Scriptures of divine truth; how assiduous in having recourse to the fountains of salvation, and drawing thence for the refreshment of his fellow-Christians the waters of eternal life! How patient, persevering, impartial and reverent, were his inquiries after Christian truth; and when he had found it, how frankly did he avow, how fearlessly maintain it! To one who had only a very casual acquaintance with his pursuits and studies, he might have appeared the cold critic or the eager polemic; but a little farther acquaintance would speedily have dissipated the error, and would have shewn him always striving for truth, not for victory; holding every truth which he was enabled to discover in its just integrity and in connection with its quickening spiritual power; and taking rank with the defenders of a faith that is everywhere spoken against, not in the spirit of a contentious antagonism, but in that of humble fidelity to Christ, and patient endurance of the cross which such fidelity demanded that he should bear. Never was there a man more eminent than our revered friend for the just union of the doctrinal with the practical, both in religion and in ordinary life. Never was there a man who had a more quickening and abiding faith in the efficiency of great truths and principles, or who more firmly and nobly applied them in the determination of his own conduct. It was characteristic of him, throughout the lengthened and conspicuous course which Providence assigned him, that he walked "by faith and not by sight;" never impatient of success, never desponding under difficulties; but always trustful, cheerful, hopeful, diligent in doing his own work, and leaving the result of his eminently judicious, enlightened and assiduous labours to the disposal of Infinite Wisdom.

And as he was thus diligent and faithful in the investigation, avowal and practical application of divine truth himself, so was he ever anxious to enable others to share with him its light and freedom. With what friendly and affectionate earnestness did he ever strive to win his hearers to the maintenance of truth and goodness! With what untiring assiduity did he devote himself to the instruction and culture of the rising race! What a noble example did he set in his own person of that reverence and love for the house of God, which he ever deemed essential to the formation of the Christian character! How munificent were his contributions to the education of young men for the efficient conduct of the services of that house, and how powerful the encouragement which his example and cheering approval gave them to be steadfast and diligent in their preparatory studies and exercises! For with our venerable friend, these preparatory

studies were never permitted to die of neglect; but by persevering renewal of them day by day, he retained the treasures of knowledge which they had enabled him to acquire, while he laboured to increase his store.

Among those of us who were engaged at the same time with himself in the active duties of the Christian ministry, our venerable friend's cordiality and kindness were such as to our latest hour we must remember with unspeakable gratitude. The acknowledged superiority which ability, attainments and experience conferred on him, augmented by the outward advantages of his worldly position, he never employed with the intent of lording it over his brethren; but while he was justly tenacious of his own clear and well-considered opinions, and while we delighted to look up to him, as our revered and beloved Father in the Christian Ministry, with that filial affection with which we now mourn his loss, no man could more sacredly respect our individual independence, or more meekly endeavour that all things should be ever ordered and done among us in charity and peace. Hospitable and generous was he always to us, without assumption or ostentation, guiding our counsels and conversation without repressing the free utterance of thought, and ever ready to contribute liberal aid to the accomplishment of any of our plans of usefulness. I say these things in the hearing of many of my brethren in the Christian ministry, who are here this day to attest with myself their love and veneration for our departed friend; and I should not dare to dishonour his memory, or to trespass on their sacred sorrow, by any word of eulogy which the strictest adherence to truth did not fully warrant and even urgently demand at my hands.

Such was our departed friend to all who were *within* the circle of his religious connections; but within that circle, his Christian generosity and love were by no means confined. Eminent as he was as the guide and friend and benefactor of those who were united with him as members of the same household of faith, he was not less eminent for his enlarged public spirit, for his liberal political sentiments, for the earnestness with which he entered into all judicious plans of public usefulness and benevolence, for the faithfulness of his co-operation with men of every sect and party for the accomplishment of objects of general public interest. With how many benevolent institutions in this town and neighbourhood is his name indissolubly associated, and how *liberal* a supporter was he of them, less by his pecuniary gifts, munificent as these often were, than by his personal presence, counsel and co-operation! His generosity to the poor, his compassion for the distressed, irrespective altogether of sect or name or creed, who can estimate the labours or the bounty by which it was continually manifested! How habitually did he confess himself the steward of the talents committed to his trust; how faithfully

did he seek and require their definite and appropriate application; and how marked was his observance of the Christian precept, which he ever justly regarded as affording a test of sincerity and real goodness, "When thou doest thine alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth; that thine alms may be in secret."

With such a course of eminent public usefulness, directed by religious principle and prompted by religious gratitude, we know that our departed friend's private and domestic life was in perfect harmony. Already we have glanced at its closing scenes; and all of us who have ever enjoyed the privilege and happiness of this more intimate communion with him, know full well that they were only after the ordinary method of his daily life; and that the services of religion, which commenced and closed each day, were but the direct expression of that spirit of religion which animated his whole conversation and conduct. What he was as a husband, as a friend, as the master of a family, is known to all who have ever sustained towards him the reciprocal relation; and who will affectionately declare that the great principles which he maintained in the wider relations and for the more public objects of life, were always religiously observed by him in the fulfilment of its most private and ordinary duties.

And now, brethren, after an unusually long and useful and honourable and happy life—for happy it was, as I have again and again heard him gratefully acknowledge—he is gone to his reward; and we who follow to the grave in tears his mortal remains, yet rejoice to know that that reward is on high. One thing is needful to its fulness and perfection, which it becomes us, while we mourn his loss, seriously to lay to heart—that we, among whom he has lived and laboured with a piety so exalted and a love so pure, should look to ourselves that he lose not those things which he wrought in the high office in which he laboured, but that he may receive in them also a full reward (2 John 8). The time is not distant when we may hope to meet him again. May we so work like him while it is called to-day, that our last end may be like his; and that, through the Divine blessing, we may see his face again with joy in the presence of our Redeemer and our Judge!

---

#### THE ANGEL'S WATCH.

Who keeps the watch o'er earth to-night?  
'Tis I, answered an Angel bright,  
With wings dipp'd in immortal dyes,  
A heaven of love in his meek eyes,—  
'Tis I. Ah! good and faithful thou,  
And ever true to plighted vow,—  
Earth will be safe to-night; no storm  
Her sleeping rivers will deform.

Soft will the seaman's hammock lie,  
 A nest between the earth and sky,  
 And only gentle winds will be  
 His steersman and his lullaby.  
 The baby on its mother's breast,  
 Thou watching by, more sweet will rest;  
 And e'en the heart of sickness feel  
 A softness on its spirit steal,  
 As if some balm was in the air,  
 To chase away that long despair.  
 Go, watch the earth, sweet Angel—go!  
 E'en now thy heavenly eyes o'erflow,  
 Anxious to soften mortal woe:  
 Earth will be blest with holiest sleep.  
 But, my young Angel, cease to weep!

I. E. H.

---

LINES ON MY FATHER'S GRAVE.

(Translated from the German.)

“BLESSED are all who in the Lord repose!”  
 And thou, my Father, art now of the blest:  
 An angel brought thee thine immortal crown,  
 And called thy spirit to its heavenly rest.  
 Thou wanderest now among the myriad stars,  
 Or, swift as the ray darting from the sun,  
 Soarest above a thousand worlds, to gaze  
 Upon the presence of the Holy One!  
 Thou drinkest deeply at life's flowing spring,  
 Thou readest in the unrolled book of time,  
 And seest dark labyrinths of night made bright,  
 While ever clearer grows the page sublime.  
 But 'midst the glorious triumphs of thy bliss,  
 Thou sendest yet a Father's glance to me;  
 Thou prayest for me at Jehovah's throne,  
 And the great God of Mercy heareth thee.  
 And when Time's hand hath drain'd the golden urn,  
 And the last drops of life shall feebly run,  
 Hover, blest Spirit, o'er my bed of death,  
 When the last earthly conflict is begun!  
 Over my fainting brow thy palm-branch wave,  
 With freshness from sweet heavenly breezes borne,  
 And shew me, beaming thro' the Grave's dark night,  
 The brightness of the Resurrection morn!  
 O may my spirit heavenwards soar with thine,  
 In love adoring, and with rapture blest,  
 And bend with thee before Jehovah's throne,  
 And in the fulness of His presence rest!  
 Yet bloom, meanwhile, in beauty here, sweet rose,  
 And o'er his grave thy crimson blossoms fling;  
 For *here* the precious seed that we have sown,  
 Awaits the dawn of an immortal spring!

W.

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*History of the American Revolution.* By George Bancroft. In Three Volumes. Vol. II. 8vo. Pp. 524. London—Bentley.

THERE is an obvious inconvenience in criticising an historical work by piecemeal. But having been tempted to give a brief critical notice of the former volume of this portion of Mr. Bancroft's great historical work, we lose no time in announcing the publication of this volume, which possesses many claims to attention. It details what we may call the second act of the great drama of the American Revolution, and shews how Great Britain estranged the affection of its Transatlantic colony. The wholesale system of jobbing and profligate expenditure which had prevailed to a great extent in the reign of George II., attained in the early years of the reign of his successor to a fearful height. The revenue of England, great as it was, and increasing too, was unequal to the reckless expenditure, and it was resolved to extort a further revenue from America by direct taxation. George III., besides being destitute of statesmanship, and incapable of seeing the consequences of the mad policy devised by his grasping ministers, had a ridiculously extravagant sense of his kingly prerogative. Having asserted his right to tax his American subjects, their resistance of the claim made him still more eager to vindicate his prerogative, and this he struggled to effect by a lavish expenditure of blood and treasure. The change in the national condition and prospects of England effected during the first ten years of the reign of George III., was as disastrous as remarkable. The sun of his grandfather set in glory,—the people prosperous and united in the enjoyment of peace, and public affairs ruled by a minister of irreproachable integrity and well-deserved popularity. Scarcely had the new King ascended the throne, when the change began; factions of the bitterest kind sprung into active existence, and a struggle arose with the colony of America which ended in the humiliation of England and its King.

The volume before us contains the history of little more than three years, viz., from 1763 to 1766. It bears tokens, we think, of the increased care and matured powers of its author. The style is more calm and dignified than was always the case in the *History of the Colonization of America*. Mr. Bancroft's familiarity with England and the English, would be creditable to a native describing contemporary events. He is deeply read in our politics, literature and biography, during the eighteenth century, and often happily borrows from the letters, speeches and diaries of the great actors and their contemporaries, a paragraph or a phrase that throws the scene he is describing into the strongest light. The volume opens with a sketch, extending through four chapters, drawn by a master's hand, of the state of Europe in 1763; two chapters are devoted to England and its dependencies. Possibly Mr. Bancroft may by some critics be charged, in this portion of his work, with a discursive forgetfulness of his own special subject. But such a criticism would be unjust. We must confess we were disposed to apply it to that portion of the fourth chapter which described with singular exactness and power the state of Irish parties and opinions, when we met

with the remarkable statement, quite new to us, that a very extensive emigration took place from Ireland to America, consisting chiefly of Protestant families of Scottish extraction, carrying with them to their Transatlantic home no submission to England. The first voice publicly raised in America to dissolve the connection with the mother country arose, not from the Puritans of New England or the Dutch of New York, but from Presbyterian emigrants from Ulster. (Pp. 85, 86.)

We might be tempted to make many extracts, did our space permit. From the sketch of England in 1763, we take the description of the Church.

"In England the Church had no independent power; and its connection with the State was purchased by its subordination. None but conformists could hold office; but in return, the Church, in so far as it is a civil establishment, was the creature of Parliament; a statute enacted the articles of its creed, as well as its Book of Prayer; it was not even entrusted with a co-ordinate power to reform its own abuses; any attempt to have done so would have been treated as an usurpation; amendment could proceed only from Parliament. The Convocations of the Church were infrequent, and if laymen were not called to them, it was because the assembly was merely formal. Through Parliament the laity ruled the Church. It seemed, indeed, as if the Bishops were still elected; but it was only in appearance; the Crown, which gave leave to elect, named also the person to be chosen, and obedience to its nomination was enforced by the penalties of a *præmunire*.

"The laity, too, had destroyed the convents and monasteries, which, under other social forms, had been the schools, the poor houses and the hostleries of the land; and, all the way from Netley Abbey to the rocky shores of Northumberland, and even to the remote loneliness of Iona, had filled the country with the ruins of buildings, which once rose in such numbers and such beauty of architecture, that they seemed like a concert of voices engaged in a hymn of praise. And the property of the Church, which had been enjoyed by the monasteries that undertook the performance of the parochial offices, had now fallen into the hands of impropiators; so that the fund set apart for charity, instruction and worship, often became the plunder of laymen, who took the great tithes, and left a remaining pittance to their vicars.

"The lustre of spiritual influence was tarnished by this strict subordination to the temporal power. The clergy had never slept so soundly over the traditions of the Church; and the dean and chapter, at their cathedral stalls, seemed like strangers encamped among the shrines, or lost in the groined aisles which the fervid genius of men of a different age and a heartier faith had fashioned; filling the choir with religious light from the blended colours of storied windows, imitating the graceful curving of the lambent flame in the adornment of the tracery, and carving in stone every flower and leaf of the garden to embellish the light column, whose shafts soared upwards, as if to reach the sky.

"The clergy were Protestant and married. Their great dignitaries dwelt in palaces, and used their vast revenues, not to renew cathedrals, or beautify chapels, or build new churches, or endow schools; the record of their wealth was written in the rolls of the landed gentry, into which the fortunes they accumulated introduced their children; so that the Church, though it was represented among the barons, never came in conflict with the landed aristocracy, with which its interests were identified."—Pp. 37—39.

Mr. Bancroft is very happy in his pictorial descriptions of the Red Men. He does not conceal their bloodthirstiness and craft, but he does justice to their virtues. A short extract will illustrate his powers in this way. It relates to Pontiac's war.

*Indian Strategy.*

"At Michilimackinac, a spot of two acres on the main land, west of the strait, was inclosed with pickets, and gave room for the cabins of a few traders, and a fort with a garrison of about forty souls. Savages had arrived near it, as if to trade and beg for presents. From day to day the Chippewas, who dwelt in a plain near the fort, assembled to play ball. On the 2nd day of June, they again engaged in the game, which is the most exciting sport of the Red Men. Each one has a bat carved like a crozier, and ending in a racket. Posts are planted apart on the open prairie. At the beginning of the game the ball is placed midway between the goals. The eyes of the players flash; their cheeks glow; their whole nature kindles. A blow is struck; all crowd with violence and merry yells to renew it; the fleetest in advance now driving the ball home, now sending it sideways, with one unceasing passionate pursuit. On that day the squaws entered the fort, and remained there. Etherington, the commander, with one of his lieutenants, stood outside of the gate watching the game, fearing nothing. The Indians had played from morning till noon, when, throwing the ball close to the gate, they came behind the two officers, and seized and carried them into the woods; while the rest rushed into the fort, snatched their hatchets, which their squaws had kept hidden under their blankets, and in an instant killed an officer, a trader and fifteen men. The rest of the garrison, and all the English traders, were made prisoners, and robbed of everything they had; but the French traders were left at liberty and unharmed. Thus fell the old post of Mackinaw on the main."—Pp. 137, 138.

We have one or two slight criticisms to offer on some incidental statements by Mr. Bancroft. In describing the Universities in 1763, he ascribes to Oxford as well as Cambridge a large degree of loyalty. "The sentiment of loyalty," he says, "hovered over the meadows of Christ Church and the walks of Maudlin" (p. 53). The spirit of Jacobitism was in 1763 far from extinct in Oxford. Earlier in the century it had been so rampant, that riots took place, occasioned by the resistance of the students to loyal celebrations by the friends of the House of Hanover. Once during the century a troop of dragoons, under the command of General Pepper, was despatched to Oxford, expressly to overawe the turbulent and disloyal spirit of the University, and on that occasion Col. Owen, an agent of James, very narrowly escaped by leaping over a wall, in his night-gown, into the very walks of Maudlin, which Mr. Bancroft has selected as the scene over which the loyalty of the University hovered. In 1763, Dr. William King died, holding the office of Principal of St. Mary's Hall at Oxford, and so deeply tainted was he with Jacobite politics, that when Prince Charles Edward, in 1750, made a secret visit to London, the Principal of St. Mary's Hall was one of the few persons admitted to his presence. As late, too, as 1758, John, the seventh Earl of Westmoreland, was elected Chancellor of the University expressly on account of his Jacobite politics. True it is that Oxford did afterwards become obsequiously loyal to George III., but not until he had shewn himself almost as despotic in his estimate of the Royal prerogative as the race of Stuarts, to whom Oxford gave its first love.

Mr. Bancroft is inaccurate, and, we must add, unnecessarily harsh, in speaking of Dr. Priestley. He is describing the state of English Metaphysical philosophy in 1763, and says, "*the chillingly repulsive Priestley* asserted that the soul was but of flesh and blood." Mr. Bancroft alludes, we suppose, to Dr. Priestley's *Disquisitions on Matter and*

Spirit, and his controversy thereon with Dr. Price. In 1763, Priestley, being about thirty years of age, had only just begun at Warrington the brilliant literary and philosophical career which continued to grow brighter and brighter to the close of the century. He had then published little beyond an English Grammar and his Lectures on Language. It was not till 1777, fourteen years after the date assumed by Mr. Bancroft, that he published the "Disquisitions relating to Matter and Spirit." In the following year, the "Free Discussion" between himself and Dr. Price was published. The doctrine of materialism is to our minds chilling and repulsive; so, too, we think, is Bishop Berkeley's theory of the non-existence of matter; but we should as soon think of applying these expressions of personal antipathy to the amiable Bishop as to the gentle, candid and kind-hearted philosopher. Priestley's Free Discussion with his friend Dr. Price on Materialism and Necessity, is perhaps the last work in the English language to justify a harsh estimate of its authors. It has, by one who did not sympathize with Dr. Priestley's views on either subject, been pointed out as an edifying example "of the close discussion of the most important and least settled points of Christian faith—the moral and metaphysical—without injury to the temper of the parties engaged; nay, with the growth of their mutual respect and esteem, and even in their confidence in each other's wisdom and virtue."\* The same writer adds, he knew not "whether to admire more, the acuteness of the philosophers or the candour and benignity of the Christians."

Of Dr. Price, Mr. Bancroft remarks, that he "enforced the eternal, necessary and unchanging distinctions of morality." We may probably trace the different feeling entertained towards these distinguished men to expressions in the works and correspondence of Dr. Channing, who, like some modern Unitarians, never did justice to Dr. Priestley.

But we are loth to part with this interesting and to us delightful volume with the expression of a difference of opinion, and therefore select for further extract a passage on which we can bestow unqualified praise, and which induces us to tender at the same time to its able author our gratitude for the habitually reverential and Christian spirit in which he discusses his great historical theme.

#### *Voltaire.*

"On the side of modern life, pushing free inquiry to the utmost contempt of restraint, though not to total unbelief, Voltaire employed his peerless wit and activity. The Puritans of New England changed their hemisphere to escape from Bishops, and hated Prelacy with the rancour of faction; Voltaire waged the same warfare with widely different weapons, and, writing history as a partizan, made the annals of his race a continuous sarcasm against the hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church. His power reached through Europe; he spoke to the free-thinkers throughout the cultivated world. In the age of Scepticism he was the prince of scoffers; when Philosophy hovered round saloons, he excelled in reflecting the brilliantly licentious mind of the intelligent aristocracy. His great works were written in retirement, but he was himself the spoiled child of society. He sunned himself in its light, and dazzled it by concentrating its rays. He was its idol, and he courted its idolatry. Far from breaking with authority, he loved the people as little as he loved the Sorbonne. The complaisant courtier of sovereigns and ministers, he could

---

\* Sermons by the late Rev. Robert Aspland, II. 68, 69.

even stand and wait for smiles at the toilet of a French King's mistress, or prostrate himself in flattery before the Semiramis of the North; willing to shut his eyes on the sorrows of the masses, if the great would but favour men of letters. He it was, and not an English poet, that praised George I. of England as a sage and a hero who ruled the universe by his virtues; he could address Louis XV. as a Trajan; and when the French King took a prostitute for his associate, it was the aged Voltaire who extolled the monarch's mistress as an adorable Egeria. 'The populace which has its hands to live by,'—such are the words and such the sentiments of Voltaire, and, as he believed, of every landholder,—'the people has neither time nor capacity for self-instruction; they would die of hunger before becoming philosophers. It seems to me essential that there should be ignorant poor. Preach virtue to the lower classes; when the populace meddles with reasoning, all is lost.'

"The school of Voltaire did not so much seek the total overthrow of despotism, as desire to make his philosophy its counsellor; and shielded the vices of a libidinous oligarchy, by proposing love of self as the corner-stone of morality. The great view which pervades his writings, is the humanizing influence of letters, and not the regenerating power of truth. He welcomed, therefore, everything which softened barbarism, refined society, and stayed the cruelties of superstition; but he could not see the hopeful coming of popular power, nor hear the footsteps of Providence along the line of centuries, so that he classed the changes in the government of France among accidents and anecdotes. Least of all did he understand the tendency of his own untiring labours. He would have hated the thought of hastening a democratic revolution; and in mocking the follies and vices of French institutions, he harboured no purpose of destroying them. 'Spare them,' he would say, 'though they are not all of gold and diamonds. Take the world as it goes; if all is not good, all is passable.'

"Thus scepticism proceeded unconsciously in the work of destruction, invalidating the past, yet unable to construct the future. For good government is not the creation of scepticism. Her garments are red with blood, and ruins are her delight; her despair may stimulate to voluptuousness and revenge; she never kindled with the disinterested love of man."—Pp. 22—24.

*The Christian Name; or, Unitarian Christianity vindicated from the charge of Infidelity.* A Discourse, by Rev. J. Malcolm, of Chester: with Correspondence and Notes. London—E. T. Whitfield: Manchester—Johnson and Rawson. 1853.

BIGGERS often overshoot their mark, and, by their zeal without knowledge, serve the cause they meant to injure. The foolish attack by the Editor of a Chester newspaper on the Unitarian body, gave Mr. Malcolm, the zealous Unitarian minister of that city, a claim on public attention. To a very crowded audience, composed of Christians of all sects, the lecture now published was preached. It contains a manly defence of our right to the Christian name, and a fit rebuke to the bigotry that would deprive us of it. Additional interest is given to the publication by the Correspondence of Mr. Malcolm with the peccant Editor, who, we are not surprised to hear, has prudently retreated from a controversy for which he was little qualified.

## INTELLIGENCE.

### HIBBERT'S TRUST, OR ANTITRINITARIAN FUND.

Public announcement has already been made of the fact of the late Robert Hibbert, Esq., of Welbeck Street, London, having executed a Trust-deed, whereby his property has now become available for the promotion of Unitarian Christianity. In order that our readers may be correctly informed of the nature of this Trust, we invite their attention to two documents. No. I. is a letter to ourselves by Mr. Field. No. II. contains his suggestions to the late Mr. Hibbert respecting the proposed Trust.

#### No. I.

My dear Sir,—According to my promise, I now transmit you a copy of a paper of suggestions as to gift for the advantage of the Unitarian ministry, drawn up by me in 1847, at the request of the late Mr. Hibbert, and upon which suggestions the important Trust-deed he executed in that year was based.

I had many conferences with Mr. Hibbert as to the exact mode in which his intentions should be carried out; and ultimately, on his solicitation, put my ideas into the shape you now see, in order that they might receive his more full and quiet consideration at home. In several points he rejected my ideas; but of course it was for him to decide for himself. In particular, he determined on insisting that all recipients should be heterodox. He said he was an old pupil of Gilbert Wakefield's, and had strong views on that point. I wished him, if he decided to insist on the rejection by them of any one particular article of the orthodox faith, to fix his ban on the doctrine of the Atonement, as being a doctrine not merely metaphysical and practically incomprehensible like that of the Trinity, but one which goes to the very nature and scheme of the Divine government, and to the very fundamental principles of right and wrong. He, however, selected the other dogma as his touchstone.

I dare say that many or most of your readers will, more or less, differ from my views as to the decline of the influence of our ministers, and of our modes of thought, on the general public; and also as to the value, with reference to that influence, of endowments directed to increase ministers' stipends, or to give annuities to their widows or families. You yourself may differ from my estimate of

our literature. No doubt articles from time to time appear in your own periodical as highly deserving of estimation as those of any Review whatever. But the opinions contained in the paper were and still are, on a large view of the case, my most sincere and decided opinions; and were called for under circumstances of such a grave character, as solemnly to require a full and outspoken statement of what I MYSELF really and entirely thought. I deeply regret that there should be any ground, fancied or real, for the judgment I felt compelled to pronounce. That we may be wise enough to unite, all of us, in schemes which may yearly make that judgment less and less true, is the earnest wish of, my dear Sir, yours very truly,

EDWIN W. FIELD.

41, Bedford Row, March 3, 1853.

#### No. II.

The object is to elevate the position and the public influence of the Unitarian ministry. As to methods of doing this—

1. Gifts as additions to the income of Unitarian ministers.

These, I fear, produce little, if any, good result. Such gifts always have come, and in process of time will, I believe, unavoidably come, to be matters of mere charity, and very often of very great abuse.

2. Exhibitions to college for those educating as ministers.

These have certainly done much *harm*. They tempt into the ministry men of inferior breed and abilities, by whom even the miserable stipend of a Unitarian minister is looked on as a matter of worldly advantage, and who, if they had not been thus helped into the ministry, would have been small shopkeepers, or parish schoolmasters, or in that rank of life.

My firm conviction is that *no mere money considerations* can be accumulated to tempt able men to go into the ministry as a matter of worldly advantage. And if golden baits could be offered, I should consider them disadvantageous. Any one who goes into it except as a labour of love, will do little but mischief, as I believe.

3. By offering opportunities of attaining high intellectual position.

This I believe to be the great point to which pecuniary aid could be most usefully directed. The great point is to create a higher intellectual *bearing* in the very best and topmost of the men who go into the ministry. The present body has gone back, as compared with that of the

last age. To bring it to its former relative position, the most important improvement which could be effected would be to raise the highest among them intellectually higher. This would not only leaven the whole mass of ministers, but would materially affect their influence on society at large.

Nothing could be more important than to secure the review, by able religionists, of the great public moral subjects of each succeeding day, from what may be called the *Unitarian platform*. But, while lay Unitarians are largely engaged in newspapers, reviews, &c., the Unitarian ministry are doing little or nothing. There cannot (certainly, if the Prospective Review be excepted) be said to be at present any public Unitarian literature in England. In America, the case is very different; and the Unitarian ministers are largely occupied in enunciating the conclusions of the Unitarian modes of thought on public questions.

Two projects seem to me more eminently calculated to elevate the intellectual position of the Unitarian ministry.

1. The endowment of Professorships on theological subjects, connected as much as possible with University College, London.

University College is the focus of real liberalism in education. It must become the great seat of higher education for all who abjure the abomination of subscription to articles and *priestly* dominion over faith. And to give to those who study there some of that unbiassed religious teaching which it is the greatest glory of our body to have always practised, would be a great good. This project, however, will, I feel sure, be accomplished within a few years, and may safely be left to more public efforts. The residential Hall now in prospect must bring this project of Theological Professorships about.

2. The other project, and the one I most confidently recommend as the best possible object for the adoption of a munificent donor, is the granting (after education at College is finished) fellowships of from £120 to £200 a-year each (to be held for from *three to five*, or occasionally seven years), to the most eminent men going into the ministry, *not as a prize for past success*, but on conditions requiring them to carry further their studies, in England or abroad, in that way most likely to make them into cultivated scholars, men knowing the world and accomplished gentlemen.

This object is, for the purpose in view, the best, as I feel confident, which human foresight can devise.

The details of the scheme would (I would suggest) be to the following effect:

One such fellowship should become grantable by the Trustees *every* year. The grant should be for two or three years certain, but with power of extension as after mentioned. The candidates should be examined and approved by some independent public body, say the Senate of University College as to Literature and Science, and the Theological Professors of our new Hall as to Theology.

As a part of such examination, the power of public speaking (as in the disputations always practised in former times at Universities) should be taken into account as a qualification. That the candidates should propose to the Trustees some course of occupation they would propose to follow; as, for example, the investigation of the state of religious opinion, or of education, or of literature, on the Continent, in Russia, Mahomedan countries, or America. That the fellows shall, at least once in six months, report to the Trustees what they are doing; and that the extension of the term of holding the fellowship shall rest with the Trustees, with the approbation of the Examining Body, but that it shall rarely exceed five years, and in no case seven years. The extension from five to seven years should be an act of public solemnity, done in such a way as to denote peculiar desert. The fellows should be expected to publish the result of their peculiar studies, and, if they do that, some grant out of the funds should be made towards that object. They should not be allowed to exercise *stated*, *settled* ministry while they hold their fellowships. I would require them from time to time to express the continuance of their intention to exercise the ministry, and (if in circumstances permitting it) they should be required occasionally to preach. Some of them might act as home missionaries for a time. If no duly and *highly qualified* candidate appeared, the funds should be reserved and accumulated, and be used for the special extensions from five to seven years.

I would impose one test and one only; viz., the belief of the candidate in the impropriety of subscription to creeds and tests of faith, and the duty of individual thought and private judgment on religious matters. At any rate, I would only add to this an acknowledgment of the Scriptures as containing the rule of faith, or of Christ as our exemplar and the foundation of our hope.

I would allow men who had practised the ministry to become candidates for fellowships up to, say thirty years of age.

And in special cases, I would permit the Trustees and the Examining Body jointly, to dispense even with this rule.

In this way I believe there would, in almost every year, be brought into the ministry one man (by such training as this) very sure to exercise *great public religious influence* for the rest of his life.

As to the working of the Trust, I would require the Trustees to meet together once in a year, inviting the old Fellows and the Examining Board to meet them, and I would allow them to dine together on that occasion; and I would permit them to vary all or any of the provisions of this scheme from time to time. And as in the lapse of time all Trusts, once most useful, become unfitted to the wants of the age, I would empower and require the Trustees, once in every thirty years, to *re-enact* the old or to entirely declare new trusts, purposes and objects, having regard only to the one leading desire of recognizing the supremacy of the religious element in man, and the right and duty of exercising free inquiry upon it. I would give them a similar power at any period during the Trust, provided that the new purposes were approved of by two-thirds of the Trustees and two-thirds of the Examining Board on three successive annual meetings.

I would not use the word "Unitarian" in the Trust. Our Law Courts would be sure to fix some improper meaning on it.

The Trustees should be laymen. If our new Hall got a Charter, and so became a Corporation, its Council could well be allowed to be appointed to the charge of the Trust.

EDWIN W. FIELD.

41, Belford Row, March, 1847.

On the 19th of July, 1847, Mr. Hibbert executed a Trust-deed, by which he transferred into the joint names of himself and Messrs. Mark and Robert Philips, 50,000 dollars in the 6 per cent. stock of the State of Ohio, also eight railway bonds for the sum of £1000 each, to create a Trust Fund. The Trustees are directed to pay the income to the donor for his life, and after his decease to his widow for her life; and after their death to apply the income arising from the property, "in such manner as they in their uncontrolled discretion shall from time to time deem most conducive to the spread of Christianity in its most simple and intelligible form, and to the unfettered exercise of the right of private judgment in matters of religion." The Trustees are empowered to adopt the scheme

set forth in the schedule, and may also revise it from time to time, and at least once in twenty-five years. None of the income or principal of the Fund is to be spent in building. Power is given to appoint new and additional Trustees, who are to be laymen. The funds are to be vested in the names of at least three Trustees. The new Trustees to have the same power as original Trustees. The Trustees are declared not subject to control of any Court of Equity as to the use of their discretion. All proceedings of the Trustees to be valid, if directed by two-thirds (provided they are not less than six); they also have the power of appointing an executive Committee. There must be four Trustees present at every meeting. All reasonable costs and expenses of the Trustees are to be paid out of the income of the Fund.

The schedule referred to in the Deed contains the following scheme. The Fund is to be called the Antitrinitarian Fund. Three or more Divinity scholarships are to be established with fixed stipends. The Trustees to elect the scholars after examination, also to appoint Examiners and a Secretary. Two at least of the Examiners to be Professors of University College, London. Each scholarship to be at least one-tenth of the net income of the Fund; and the Secretary's salary not to exceed one-twentieth of the income of the whole Trust Fund. One scholar at least to be elected every year. Every candidate for scholarships must be between the age of nineteen and thirty, and a graduate of the London University, or of any British, Irish, or Colonial University, where degrees are granted without subscription to articles of religion. He must also satisfy the Trustees of his purpose to exercise the ministry "among those who shall profess themselves Christians, but shall not profess any belief in the doctrine of the Trinity in any sense of that doctrine now commonly considered orthodox." He is also to state in what way he proposes to spend his time during his enjoyment of the scholarship. The examination of candidates is to be annual. No questions are to be put as to the religious belief of the candidate. The scholarships are to be held three, five or seven years, as the Trustees shall in each case decide. Scholars may officiate gratuitously as ministers, but no stated minister to enjoy a scholarship. Scholars to make a half-yearly report of their pursuits. Trustees may, if they

see fit, assist by moderate pecuniary grants the publication of the results of any scholar's studies. Each scholar is to strive to become a learned theologian, and to cultivate the tastes and manners and acquire the habits of refined and accomplished scholars, and to become thoroughly imbued with the pure spirit of Christianity, and qualified to discharge most efficiently the duties of the Christian ministry.

The Trustees not to exceed eighteen in number; their meetings to be half-yearly; proxy votes allowed; the meetings to be publicly advertised, and, with certain limitations, to be open to the public. A Trustee neglecting to attend for two whole years is disqualified, but may, after two years' interval, be re-appointed. The Trustees are to dine together half-yearly. The Trust Fund may be augmented by the investment of surplus income, and by donations and annual subscriptions.

Mr. Hibbert died Sept. 23, 1849, and Mrs. Hibbert died Feb. 15, 1853. The Fund now produces upwards of £1000 per annum, but, if brought to England, its income will be greatly diminished. The additional Trustees have been appointed, and it is intended in the course of the present year to bring the Trust into active operation.

In conclusion, we desire our readers to observe, that while we gladly give insertion to Mr. Field's letter and suggestions, we do not profess to adopt all his opinions.

#### ROSCOE CENTENARY AT LIVERPOOL.

The hundredth anniversary of the birthday of WILLIAM ROSCOE was celebrated on March 8, with great éclat and success. The idea originated with Mr. James Boardman, one of the few surviving friends of Mr. Roscoe, in a letter addressed to the Literary and Philosophical Society, which, in conjunction with the other learned Societies of the town, and aided by the hearty co-operation of the Mayor, made the requisite arrangements. The proceedings of the day commenced by a breakfast in the magnificent Philharmonic Hall, pronounced by Madame Grisi to be *le plus beau salon du chant en l'Europe*. The tables for the principal guests were elevated on a dais which ran across the end of the Hall opposite the orchestra, the other tables running down the length of the Hall, every seat being occupied, and the boxes and galleries filled with spectators, one of whom described the *coup*

*d'œil* as resembling Martin's picture of Belshazzar's Feast. The resemblance would have been closer had it been night, the mode of lighting the Hall being by a beading of gas jets running round the cornice, not unlike the brilliant radiance which the painter causes to flash forth from the handwriting on the wall. Invitations had been despatched to various eminent literary men at a distance, all of whom, however, from various causes, were prevented from attending, which caused some disappointment, though it was also felt to be not inappropriate to the occasion that its interest should be sustained by local resources. The presence of Gibson the sculptor, a *protégé* of Mr. Roscoe, would have added an appropriate interest; but being at Rome, he could only send a letter expressive of his heartfelt sympathy. Dr. Traill, of Edinburgh, and the Rev. James Aspinall, the liberal and eloquent rector of Althorpe, two other friends of Mr. Roscoe, would also have been warmly welcome. An elaborate letter of apology, doing special honour to the memory of Mr. Roscoe as a botanist, was received from Dr. Wallich, of London. It may serve to shew the minute attention paid to appropriateness in details, to mention that the tickets for the breakfast were lithographed from a design by Mr. Mayer, representing the bust of Roscoe being crowned by the Muses of History and Poetry, the Genius of Liverpool, attended by the Graces, looking on with approbation, and Fame proclaiming the event. Every guest was also presented, by the liberality of local publishers, with a beautiful copy of Dr. Traill's Memoir of William Roscoe, Washington Irving's Sketch, a paper by Mr. Mayer on Roscoe and his Influence on the Fine Arts, read before the Historic Society, together with one or two appropriate poetical pieces. The bust of Roscoe, crowned with bays, was placed in front of the orchestra, and the bust of Lorenzi de' Medici in front of the dais. The chair occupied by the President was made from an oaken beam of the house in which Roscoe was born, not far from the site of the Hall. An anthem, the words by Roscoe, the music by Webbe, was performed as a grace before breakfast, the audience standing.

The chair was occupied by the EARL OF SEFTON, who, after calling upon Dr. Hume to read various letters of apology from invited guests, proceeded, in a few modest and manly sentences, to do honour to the memory of Roscoe, ob-

serving, that such a celebration compelled him to make an exception to his usual rule of privacy and quiet, imposed upon him by the state of his health. He then called upon William Rathbone, Esq., (whose name was received with loud and long cheering,) as the most fitting man, both from his personal friendship with Roscoe and his acknowledged worth, to introduce the subject of the day.

Mr. RATHBONE delivered the following address:—My Lord, Ladies and Gentlemen, you must excuse me for reading that which I do not feel myself sufficiently in self-possession to deliver:—As one of the very few left, who, not only by inheritance, but by personal knowledge, have loved and revered him whose centenary we have this day met to commemorate, the Committee have urged me to attempt a task for which I painfully feel my own inadequacy and inability to do justice to the great moral which his lengthened and consistent life conveyed; namely, the high intellectual and moral position to which he was self-raised. He commenced his very existence with, as it were, an instinctive aim at what a man ought to be, what he may become, by a single eye, an indomitable energy, a pure heart, a generous and devoted philanthropy. (Cheers.) Born of respectable parents, the son of the market gardener—as he used often, with a true nobility of soul, to remark—commenced the happiest period of his life by the dutiful aid to his father in his employments. Even then his thoughts were raised to higher objects. He early sought and found friends with congenial aspirations, with whom, to their mutual honour, friendships were formed which lasted through life. The graphic sketch of Dr. Traill points out how energetic and how varied were his pursuits after knowledge, and to what noble ends his first efforts were devoted. I may briefly refer to his early poem of “Mount Pleasant,” written, it is stated, when he was sixteen, giving the promise of what his future career would be in that generous and enthusiastic demand for humanity and justice to the slave, which, at that dark period of the history of Liverpool, he was earnestly warned it would crush all his future prospects in life to assert. Roscoe commenced life with this proof of the philanthropy and moral courage for which, through his after life, he was so consistently conspicuous. Yet Roscoe’s courage was not that of brute force: it was

equalled by his courtesy—his reluctance to give pain—his childlike simplicity and dependence on the sympathy and affection of those he loved—his desire for the good-will of those by whom he was surrounded—so far as this could be accomplished without any surrender of principle, or any compromise with the sacred claims of justice or humanity. (Hear, hear!) I need hardly add, that he was the consistent and fearless advocate of civil and religious liberty—had learned that most difficult of all lessons, tenderly and respectfully to value that liberty of conscience to others, which he had ever held as one of his own highest prerogatives. (Cheers.) Roscoe commenced his life by asserting the liberty of the slave. He set on foot a subscription to liberate the debtor from the gaol. He wrote earnestly in favour of peace on earth and good-will to men. He closed his life as he had begun, giving his last energies to the great subject of prison discipline with such unabated zeal, that his protest against solitary confinement brought on the paralytic attack which closed the more active life of the poet, the naturalist, the patriot, the historian, the lover of nature, the patron of art, and, above all, the Christian philanthropist. (Loud applause.)

We may appropriately append here the following remarks from Mr. Rathbone’s pen, which were embodied in an excellent article from the *Liverpool Times*, re-published in a separate account of the proceedings:

“Amongst the distinguishing characteristics of the mind of Roscoe, were his powers of concentrating his energies upon the object immediately under his consideration, united with an extraordinary facility of changing his attention, when necessary, from one object to another, whether his own, or that of those who sought his sympathy or aid, or wished to benefit by the wisdom of his advice.

“His mental and moral powers were increased by his profound respect for, and generous confidence in, human nature as such. His self-respect, added to the courtesy of his manners, so embodied this great principle as a part of himself, as at first sight to secure the confidence of all who came within the sphere of his influence. This was rendered all but irresistible by the buoyancy and hopefulness of his own feelings, the evidence of his earnest desire to arrive at a knowledge of the truth, and his confidence that it would prevail,

the candour with which he weighed the arguments of those who differed from him, and added weight to his views from the evidence of his religious trust in the beneficial rule of a superintending Providence, directing all to ultimate good, and to the intellectual and moral progress of the whole family of mankind. His figure was tall, dignified and graceful; his countenance thoughtful and impressive, but, when lighted up by some congenial feeling, radiant with the benevolence of which it was the faithful image.

"The confiding truthfulness of childhood read these characteristics of a truly great mind—drew close to the form which manhood approached with reverence—childhood, with the intuitive assurance of the sympathetic smile of affection."

At the close of Mr. Rathbone's address, an elaborate paper on Roscoe's literary merits was read by the Rev. A. HUME, LL.D., Secretary of the Historic Society, in the course of which he alluded to the candour manifested by his aristocratic leanings as an historian, in spite of his strong popular sympathies; he pointed out the resemblance of the age of Lorenzo and Leo to the present, in the vast stimulus given to emigration by the discovery of gold in remote regions; he alluded to the centenary of the Revolution, in the celebration of which, in Liverpool, Roscoe took an active part in 1788; he instanced Jeremiah Horrocks, of Toxteth Park, as an eminent astronomer, to whom Liverpool gave birth more than two centuries ago; he reviewed the state of learning, science and art in Liverpool at the present moment, looking forward with hope to an increased encouragement of them; and he concluded with an eloquent prediction of the future greatness of the now vast and rapidly-increasing town.

The noble CHAIRMAN, after paying a merited compliment to Dr. Hume's address, called upon Mr. William Caldwell Roscoe, who sat on his left hand, to respond in acknowledgment of the honour paid to the memory of his distinguished grandfather.

Mr. W. C. ROSCOE, on rising, said: My Lord, Ladies and Gentlemen,—It is my duty and my singular honour to attempt some response to those two able and eloquent addresses by which the special subject of to-day has been introduced to your notice; and I am sure I shall not be accused of mock modesty, if I say how keenly I feel the

responsibility that that honour brings with it, and how totally inadequate I feel myself to give any just expression to the feelings which, on such an occasion as this, must inspire all those who have the honour to be united with Mr. Roscoe by the closest ties of memory and filial affection. This is not a common honour, and this is not a common occasion which, on a working day in Liverpool and in business hours, crowds this spacious hall with men who have come from the flags of the Exchange, and the counting-house, and the Docks, to pay respect to the memory of one of their own citizens. And, though Liverpool is accused sometimes of paying too close and undivided attention to commercial interests, this is not a man who was signalized by those qualities which generally command the respect of such a community; not a man who had devoted himself to the material interests of his native town, though he was not indifferent to these; not a man who, by his legislative influence, had given scope to her commerce and a fresh range of freedom to her enterprise; but a man whose influence was, if anything, rather opposed to these; the lesson of whose life, if it taught anything to a mercantile community, taught them this—that the every-day business of a man's life, though of the highest importance, and though he would have been the last to neglect it, is yet subordinate to a higher purpose, that of bringing intellectual culture into nobler development. He himself, if he taught anything, taught this; and he himself would most have valued this day, because it is a tribute from his own townsmen; and because being a tribute from his own townsmen gives it a peculiar character of utility, and is itself an evidence of his own practical influence. By the extent of the attendance here to-day is in some respects measured the influence which Mr. Roscoe's character has exerted. (Cheers.) Merchants come here to-day to bear evidence, not to his mercantile merits, but to his merits independently of mercantile pursuits, to the value of intellectual culture. It is for this reason that he, who always esteemed a practical success and a practical work above all principles, would have most valued the testimony of this day. It is recorded of him that he esteemed the most honoured and most gratifying day of his life, not that when "the son of a market-gardener," as Mr. Rathbone justly called him, was

admitted as an equal into the highest society of men of rank, of men of letters and of talent—not the day when the publication of his great work brought him European applause—none of these times; but the day when the practical efforts of his life were crowned with practical success; the day when he went out into the lobby of the House of Commons, one of the majority who put an end to the evils of the African slave-trade. (Loud and enthusiastic cheering.) And there is another reason why the evidence of his own townsmen is the highest applause that could possibly have been given to Mr. Roscoe. The influence, I believe, of all great men—certainly of most great men—depends less upon their actual achievements than upon that course of life and that character which has enabled them to achieve those things which they have done. It is the subtler influence of character, it is the life which is led under the eyes of a man's own friends and his own fellow-citizens, that has the most true and real effect. Though it may be less perceived, it is that which truly nourishes fresh springs of life, which ennobles and invigorates character. It is, like rain, little seen in its immediate consequences, but which fructifies the whole field and ripens the whole harvest; while his achievements are rather like the single course of a river, fructifying only on its banks. As a historian, as a poet, as a botanist, even as a philanthropist, Mr. Roscoe can be judged of in other places. But here you applaud him and honour his memory as a citizen and as a man. That is the highest character in which he can possibly be honoured. (Cheers.) Only another word, and I will detain you no longer. It is especially appropriate on this day that the organization of this great occasion should have proceeded from the literary societies in this town—from those who represent the highest elements of culture in Mr. Roscoe's character; and it is highly appropriate that Dr. Hume, as the representative of that body of men, should have given you that powerful and eloquent address, in which he has dilated upon the literary merits of Mr. Roscoe. But, as I esteem above all things a tribute to Mr. Roscoe as a citizen, so I feel doubly glad that the great sentiment of the day, and its introduction to you, should have fallen into the hands of one who, from his personal friendship and intimate relations with Mr. Roscoe, is best entitled to the place,

and who, as a citizen, most aptly represents and expresses the opinion of Liverpool. But you more appropriately pronounce upon the man's life as he lived here amongst you. And I think, in the present day especially, there is no character in which a man more justly deserves well of his citizens, than as a gentleman who, living in his native town, discharges fully and completely the duties of a citizen. We hear much of the duties of country gentlemen who live upon their estates. I believe they do well; and while I should be the last to disparage those duties, I believe the gentleman who is faithful to the interests of his native town, has a more difficult duty to perform, and perhaps occupies a more responsible situation at the present day. It requires of him not only those qualities which usually distinguish English gentlemen; not only liberal hospitality, and wide and unostentatious charity; but it requires from him a large self-sacrifice. He must be capable of devoting himself to various interests; he must meet with frequent opposition; and he must have courage and much self-denial in the present complicated state of society, to be true to the duties of a citizen. And I believe if I were to ask all this assembly to point to the man who most fully amongst you now justifies that character, every hand would be pointed to my friend Mr. Rathbone—(loud cheers)—as the truest and best exponent of that character; and it is for this reason that I am truly gratified, and that all members of Mr. Roscoe's family will be most truly gratified, that the introduction of the main sentiment of the day should have fallen into his hands. I am afraid he won't thank me for this allusion; but I should have done injustice to my own feelings if I had refrained from even this brief and inadequate expression of them. (Loud applause.)

The CHAIRMAN then called upon the Mayor, SAMUEL HOLME, Esq., who sat on his right, and who addressed the meeting with distinguished ability and eloquence.

The CHAIRMAN called upon one whose spare, slight form, and plain, puritanical face, singularly contrasting with the bulky proportions of the Mayor, next whom he sat, gave little indication of so imposing a presence as that of the Right Reverend Father in God, the Lord Bishop of CHESTER. His Lordship, however, addressed the assembly with characteristic good feeling

and good taste, set off by the charm of graceful simplicity and classic elegance and neatness of diction. The subject entrusted to him was, the connection of literature and commerce. After an appropriate opening, the Bishop proceeded as follows:—Among so many persons as are assembled here, there are, no doubt, many points—important points—on which we differ in opinion from each other; but the points of difference enter not into the object of this meeting. Its object is one which can, without any compromise of principle, unite us all; because it is the simple desire to do honour to the name and memory of an eminent man, who, in his generation, by a long course of active beneficence, contributed largely and lastingly to the improvement of his native town, and, by his genius and writings, has pre-eminently enriched and adorned the literature of his country. (Loud applause.) As a biographer, or I ought rather, perhaps, to say as an historian—for his biographies possess the importance and rise to the dignity of histories—as an historian, you have been truly told that his merits have been subjected to the test and ordeal of criticism, and that his fame had received the stamp of time. I only touch the point to make one remark in connection with it. In that fame, if I may speak my mind, the happiest incident of all is, that the writings by which it has been gained contained no single sentiment, no single line, that can weaken the principles of right and wrong, or taint or sully moral purity. (Loud cheers.) His fame belongs to the nation, to the country at large, and to its literature; but yet his name possesses an especial claim to commemoration here, because Liverpool was his birthplace, and his home, in its sunshine and in its shade. But his name also, I think, possesses a peculiar interest in this great commercial town, in connection with the particular point to which I have been directed to speak,—I mean in this respect, from the fact that Roscoe was a man of business as well as a man of letters, and combined, in a degree that has been rarely seen, the pursuits of literature and of commerce. (Applause.) I have said that he combined them in a degree rarely seen; but the subject that has been put into my hands would not permit me, even if I thought I could, to speak of learning and commerce as being uncongenial elements, between which there is no affinity. (Hear!) Far from that, there is a

great connection between them, and they exercise a reciprocal influence upon each other. (Applause.) Commerce is the great civilizer of this world, and it is in this respect the handmaid of learning. (Cheers.) No nation of the world ever gave a more magnificent example of this than our own country does at the present day, and no place in the country more than your great town and port. (Applause.) Our commerce brings us into contact with all parts of the globe; our vessels spread their sails and steer their way to the most distant climes; and, as has been said by Dr. Hume so eloquently, colonies of our fellow-countrymen have planted, and are still more widely planting themselves, like a girdle, around the earth. (Renewed applause.) In all these wide-extended points, wherever colonies and commerce spread, there will spread also our English race, our English tongue, and our English literature. (Hear!) There, where now the recent settler is merely rearing the rude shed to shelter him from the elements; there, and yet further onward, where, as yet, the adventurous step of the hardy emigrant has not penetrated; even there the day will come when, if it please Providence to bless this country and the world with peace, progress and prosperity, there the day will come when not only, as now, our manufactures will be sent to those distant climes, to supply the coarse wants and necessities of daily life, but there also the elements of society will refine themselves and settle into order. There, as here, English arts and learning and taste, will spread their genial influence and light; and there also, as here amongst ourselves, even Roscoe's name will be pronounced with honour, and Roscoe's works read with admiration. (Loud cheering.) And now, bear with me if, for a moment only, I glance at another point that has been suggested by what I have now said, and which has not been touched upon by any other, nor could so fitly have been touched upon by any as by me. I have spoken of arts, and learning, and refinement, following in the track of commerce. They will do so without any direct effort of ours, in the natural progress of civilization and in the gradual course of time. And this is a matter in which we may be well content that time should do its work. But let me say, my friends, that, whatever time may give of learning and of arts, there is one gift which ought, I will not say to follow in the track of com-

merce, but to keep pace with commerce, in its most rapid extension and its widest range; one gift more precious than all that human art and learning, or that taste and genius, have to give—the gift of the Book of God (applause)—that treasure of wisdom which is from above, that learning which is able to make wise unto salvation. (Loud applause.) I do not think the topic wide of the mark. The man whose memory we are met to honour was a philanthropist. (“Hear, hear!” and applause.) What direction more noble can philanthropy take—what nobler aim can British merchants propose to themselves—than to carry, as it is in their power to carry, the Word of God far and wide as the range of their own prosperous commerce? (Cheers.) How many vessels continually leave your river, crowded with emigrants, who gaze with heavy hearts on the receding shore, with sadness for all they leave behind, with sad forebodings for the uncertain future that awaits them, beyond the wide ocean, in a land of strangers! The poor emigrant has no library to carry out with him, no learning to take out with him, no book of amusement to cheer his voyage, no book of improvement to instruct his mind. Let him—for it is in your power—let him carry with him the Book of God, to be the companion of his voyage, and, more than that, through God’s blessing on its use, to be the anchor of his soul. (Applause.) How many vessels leave your port for distant climes without a minister of God among them! Wipe off this reproach! Safe may your vessels speed their way, safe may they return; but let some of them carry with them—for it is in your power to send—let some of them carry with them ministers of God, to spread abroad the knowledge of His word, “to make His saving health known upon earth, His name amongst all nations.” (Applause.) I know that much has been done here by good men amongst yourselves, that much has been done by good men on the other side of the river, for this end; but bear with me if I say what was said of intellectual advancement—much more is yet required, and much more is in your power to do. (Applause.) If I have had to stretch my hand a little to touch this chord, let my excuse be that it is a chord near my heart, and, I am willing to persuade myself, a chord that will find an echo and an answer in your own. (Applause.)—His Lordship then proceeded to recommend

the encouragement of liberal education, after the example of Roscoe, by sustaining the educational institutions in the town, and continued as follows:—And now I did not mean to say a word more, had not the point been touched upon also by Dr. Hume in his beautiful address. Let me, as my last word, ask you, also, not only to be patrons of liberal education; but as I spoke of learning stooping to the humble classes, let me trust that those present may be, what Roscoe was in his day, patrons of the education of the poor. (Applause.) We have many institutions in this place directed to that end, of which, if time permitted, I would speak in commendation. I might point to many schools connected with our Church; I might point—for I do not wish to confine my praise within ungenerous limits)—I might point to many schools in connection with other religious denominations. (“Hear!” and applause.) But, I must be allowed to say, they all fall far short of the exigencies of the case. Our machinery is not equal to meet the exigencies of the case. A larger system is required; but I may say, without offence, I hope, that even our present machinery is capable of being made immensely more effective, if it was but fed with larger streams of bounty here. (“Hear, hear!” and applause.) I know that in Liverpool there are many generous men, whose hearts are always open in every good work of charity, whatever be the object of the subscription-list. There, we still see the same list, the same constellation, the same galaxy of names, ever ready to come forward with their patronage and taste to forward every good work connected with the welfare of the place. Would that we could induce others, whose attention we have not succeeded in engaging—would that we could induce them also to put their shoulders to the good work, and add their names to the noble list! If they desire to follow in Roscoe’s steps—if they desire to have their names remembered as benefactors of their town—what nobler or what better way could they take than this? And if their name be never remembered, bright as is the wreath which human fame can give, yet let me say, there was reserved for Christian charity a brighter and more enduring crown.—The Right Reverend Prelate concluded by stating that he had gladly joined in the proceedings of the day, to do honour to a learned man, a most eloquent historian, and, not least, a great benefactor of his native town.

The meeting was next addressed by Mr. JAMES CROSSLEY, of Manchester, President of the Cheetham Society, who, in a few elegant and well-turned periods, paid his tribute to the memory of that intellectual power, that elegant and accomplished mind, which, evermore to the imagination of the passing stranger, has peopled the busy scene around us with the majestic and magnificent personages of Italian story, the Lorenzos and Politians of old, which brought us again under the warm sunshine of "Leo's golden days,"

When Raphael painted and a Vida sung,

and which has irradiated even the tides of his native Mersey with reflected splendour from the Mincio and the Arno.

Mr. J. S. MANSFIELD, the Stipendiary Magistrate of the borough, was then called upon. His predecessor, Mr. Rushton, had he been living, would have taken a lively interest in the occasion, from his hereditary friendship with the subject of the celebration. Mr. Mansfield had not this advantage. He was also a comparative stranger in the town. With Roscoe he had little in common, except what every other stranger must have—admiration for his genius, esteem for his virtue; and genius and virtue were not local. (Applause.) He had heard much, from several of the speakers who had hitherto claimed their attention, upon the various qualities of mind of that person whose memory they had assembled to commemorate that day. Now, he agreed with the Essays of Elia, that "for a man to be truly great, his mind must be well balanced." Roscoe possessed a well-balanced mind, and he thought that his success was mainly to be attributed to that circumstance. It was true that he was fond of nature; those good and great could hardly be otherwise. He was also devoted to art; and what was art but that which held the mirror up to nature? (Applause.) He was also distinguished for his literary attainments. He was an historian, and he carefully sought out and illustrated the great and distinguished actions of others. But in this he was fortunate; it was not only left to him to write the good deeds of others, but he has also left actions of his own which, at the space of one hundred years, had a claim upon our admiration. (Loud applause.) Taking the widest view of the world, civilization and man, much had been attained, though it would seem that

on the continent of Europe there was something like a halt in the forward motion. But he had that confidence in the progress of man, that, although the advance might be like the waves of the sea, one bursting forward and then receding again, still the tide rushed in, and the estuary was filled. (Applause.) But let them go nearer to themselves, to Roscoe, on the present occasion,—let them look at what had been achieved by men like Roscoe and his contemporaries for civilization. (Applause.) First in a free country were the political institutions of that country. Roscoe was one of the first of the band who advocated reform and purity. In the course of the last century, a great moral tempest and whirlwind spread over the continent of Europe. Most fortunately it did not extend to this country. The moral atmosphere of the country was no doubt in some degree purified by that whirlwind; but that circumstance was not sufficient; and had it not been for men like Roscoe, and those who laboured with him, we could not make the proud boast which we now do, that there is no country since the world began, in any age, which can boast of the purity of its men engaged in public life so truly as England at the present moment. Upon one other subject he would make a remark before he sat down. Many changes had passed in this century. Howard and Roscoe had improved our prisons, the blood-stained criminal code which had prevailed had been altered. We now aimed, not at the vindictive punishment of prisoners, but at their reformation. (Applause.) But above this, there was another thing which he thought a subject of the noblest congratulation. It had just been alluded to by one of the previous speakers. At the time that Roscoe laboured, it was a bold thing that he should protest against England being engaged in the accursed slave-trade; but much more had been achieved since Roscoe had departed. At the present moment, the foreign slave-trade, by a fortunate concurrence of circumstances, seemed quite annihilated. (Applause.) The good deeds of men lived after them—(applause)—and it was this which induced him to speak of this subject in connection with the name of Roscoe. This was a subject on which, supposing England should ever perish—supposing, as had been fancifully thought, that a New Zealander, from the ruins of an arch of London-bridge, should meditate on the mouldering ruins of

St. Paul's,—such New Zealander, if instructed in the history of the world, might say, the nation has passed away; it was mighty in war, great in commerce. But there were other nations mighty in war and great in commerce. There were merchant princes of Tyre, Carthage and Venice, inferior to none. The great military nation that dominated over the world were unmatched for their prowess; the French in modern times have not been surpassed by the English in military glory; but in generous, disinterested humanity, England was marked above all the nations of the earth. (Loud applause.) She had shed out her blood as if it were water, her gold as if it were dross, for the sake of promoting the common interests of humanity, as in the case of the abject African. This was one of the matters in which Roscoe was deeply interested, and therefore he had not thought it inappropriate to mention it upon the present occasion. He thought his success had been owing to that happy mixture of qualities to which he had before referred; and these seemed to have enabled him to carry those points which others less fortunate might have failed to do, and it had made him an example of a good and useful man, which we might recal. As long as genius commanded respect and virtue esteem, so long would the memory of Roscoe be commemorated. (Applause.) Therefore, there needed no excuse for those gentlemen who had called them together. It was certainly a duty which we owed to posterity that these solemn occasions should take place; that men might know what homage was paid to virtue, what admiration was given to intellect, even when the ear could no longer hear, and the heart no longer receive, the praise and congratulations of our fellow-men. (Loud applause.)

The Rev. Dr. RAFFLES then moved a vote of thanks to the Earl of Sefton for his conduct in the chair, justly observing, that the proceedings had been such as to leave no real ground of regret at the absence of the distinguished strangers who had been invited from a distance. His Lordship briefly acknowledged the compliment, deprecating the term "condescension," and the meeting broke up. It was altogether an occasion of high interest, most eloquently and harmoniously sustained by the right feeling and good taste of all who took part in it. It may not be out of place to append here the following lines, suggested by the scene, with which we have

been favoured by an esteemed friend, and which have not previously appeared in print :

ROSCOE, all hail to thee! thy natal day  
Inspires high thought, and tempts the  
Muse's lay.

The Banquet Hall was then a noble  
sight,

As the Sun's rays glanced down its  
lofty height,

And through its area vast thy Anthem's  
praise

Bade rise that festive throng in rev'rent  
phase.

Assembled there, they gladly honour  
give

To him whose merits still endearing  
live.

Though years a hundred saw their end  
that day,

An incense sweet to thee did that feast  
pay:

One said 'twas like the lordly, proud  
array

(As a famed Painter's skill did well  
portray)

Which erewhile filled Belshazzar's  
sumptuous hall;

But without warning words of awful  
call.

Thy head, time-honoured, stood with  
laurel crown,

A beacon there, but with no threat-  
'ning frown:

Thy friend's just praise—that truly  
"honest man"—

The Bishop's voice serene—all warmly  
ran

On thy bright, sterling virtues; talents  
rare,

Thy genius high, and heart to feel and  
dare.

They urged our youth thy steps to fol-  
low still,

To love thy generous mind, thy earnest  
will;

And others joined to swell the fervent  
strain

That, as a pole-star, long thy light  
might reign.

The soul refined was fed with sacred  
fire,

By ROSCOE kindled: it will ne'er expire!

The next feature in the proceedings of the day consecrated to the memory of Roscoe, was the opening to the public, by the Mayor in state, of the Derby Museum, a collection of 20,000 specimens in Natural History, bequeathed to the town of Liverpool by the late Earl of Derby, and located for the present in the same building with the Free Library opened last year. The Museum

comprises also the collection of imports by Mr. Archer, and the model of the docks and town which appeared in the Great Exhibition of 1851. A crowded assembly was appropriately addressed by the Mayor; by the Rev. Rector Campbell, who responded on behalf of the town as one of the Derby Trustees; by Mr. J. A. Picton, a member of the Town Council, who has been conspicuous in his exertions on behalf of the Library and Museum; and by the Bishop of Chester. The only speech to which any exception could possibly be taken, was the long address of the Rev. Rector, a great part of which was taken up with a cold and guarded, almost reluctant, admission, that knowledge would do the working-man no harm if he did not get more of it than he could digest, and did not fail to sanctify it by religion. In conclusion, however, he pointed out the real dangers to which the working classes are exposed, in scenes of profligacy and debasement, and advocated "a well-diffused system of education," "come from what quarter it may." Mr. Picton made an express reference to the memory of Roscoe, as appropriate to the occasion.

At half-past three on the same day, a meeting took place at the Royal Institution (which, together with the Athenæum Library and Mr. Mayer's Egyptian Museum, were thrown open during the day), where an able and interesting address, descriptive of the most remarkable works of art and nature deposited within its walls, was read by J. B. YATES, Esq.

The Rev. Dr. RAFFLES, in moving a vote of thanks to Mr. Yates for his address, appropriately introduced some pleasant personal reminiscences of Mr. Roscoe, and the assembly separated.

The day wound up with a brilliant Soirée, given by the Mayor, in the splendid suite of reception-rooms at the Town Hall, the stately proportions and convenient arrangement of which we appreciated more highly after visiting the state-apartments of Windsor Castle. Everything that wealth and taste could supply, lent its aid to the occasion—magnificent plants, choice music, tables adorned with rare MSS., philosophical instruments, articles of *vertu*, original letters and memorials of Roscoe,—amongst which last we noticed extracts from the register of baptisms in Benn's Garden chapel, giving those of William Roscoe, born March 8, 1753; and his friend William Shepherd, born October 11, 1768, bap-

tized by Dr. Enfield, November 15.—In conclusion, we can only say that Liverpool did herself honour by the complete and effective manner in which, unaided, she did honour to the memory of her great Philanthropist, Historian and Poet.  
J. R.

#### MANCHESTER DOMESTIC MISSION.

On Monday, Feb. 14th, the ceremony of laying the *chief stone* of the Domestic Mission Chapel, Rochdale Road, Manchester, was performed by Martin Schunck, Esq., assisted by several ministers and friends. Although the weather was cold and ungenial, a considerable number of persons assembled to witness the proceedings. After the minister of the Mission had given out a suitable hymn, which was sung under the guidance of the school choir, the Rev. J. J. Tayler offered an impressive prayer. The ceremony of laying the principal stone of the building was then performed by Mr. Schunck, who uttered a few words appropriate to the purpose—a handsome silver trowel, subscribed for by a few friends as a mark of respect, having first been presented to him by the Rev. W. Gaskell. A brass plate,—inscribed with the names of the Secretary of the Domestic Mission, the present Minister, the Building Committee, the Architects and the Builder, and recording the date when the chief stone was laid by the principal contributor, Mr. Schunck,—was deposited in the masonry. Mr. Gaskell then read an interesting address, containing a sketch of the history of the Mission, and the steps which had led to the undertaking. A concluding prayer, followed by the benediction, pronounced by the Rev. Dr. Beard, wound up the proceedings of the day—an eventful and important one to many who were present. It ought to be added, that Martin Schunck, Esq., headed the subscription with the munificent sum of £500. About £1200 has been raised, and it is expected that some £300 more will be required to defray the cost of the land and all the expenses of completing and furnishing the building.

A tea-party, in celebration of the occasion, was held at the Miles-Plating school the same evening. After tea, the Rev. W. Gaskell, who presided, referred to the want which had long been felt of a place of worship, and spoke of the kindness shewn by Sir B. Heywood in so long allowing

the use of the present rooms. The meeting was then addressed in succession by Mr. Robert Nicholson, Rev. Dr. Beard, Rev. James Taylor, of Dob Lane, Mr. Freestone and other gentlemen, all of whom dwelt on the new facilities of usefulness about to be provided in a tone of congratulation, and offered suggestions as well as good wishes on the subject. After a few recitations and the singing of a hymn, the meeting broke up, well pleased that another step had been taken towards the desired consummation.

#### MANCHESTER DISTRICT SUNDAY-SCHOOL ASSOCIATION.

The annual meeting of this useful Society was held at Manchester on Good Friday, March 25, in the Strange-ways chapel and school-room. The day was beautifully fine, and a respectable and tolerably numerous congregation assembled at half-past ten, including Sunday-school teachers and friends from Manchester, Macclesfield, Dukinfield, Bury, Monton, Stockport, Newchurch, Padiham, Gorton, Altringham, &c. Amongst the ministers present in the course of the day, were Revds. S. Bache, J. G. Robberds, Dr. Beard, W. Gaskell, G. Harris, E. Higginson, R. B. Aspland, C. Wallace, J. Wright, T. E. Poynting, A. Worthington, W. Whitelegg, F. Bishop, G. H. Wells, J. Layhe, G. Hoade, M. C. Frankland and James Taylor. There were also present Dr. Bateman, Mr. James Robinson, Professor Bowman, &c. The religious service was most impressively conducted by Rev. Samuel Bache. Taking for his text Matthew xviii. 10, *Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones*, &c., he combined with much taste and effect reflections suitable to the day, and to the special object of their assembling. A simple but substantial meal was then served to friends from a distance in the school-room. At two o'clock the teachers and friends of the Society re-assembled in the chapel, the chair being taken by Rev. J. R. Beard, D.D. The Committee's report was read by Rev. John Wright, the indefatigable Secretary. It stated that, at the last meeting, the Association contained 39 schools, with 1052 teachers and 6874 scholars; it now consisted of 42 schools, containing 1118 teachers and 7527 scholars, an increase of 66 teachers and 653 scholars. Of these 42 schools, 39 have various connected institutions, in some instances

numerous; the most common are Libraries, Savings' Funds, Mutual Improvement Societies, and Week-evening Classes. Of the 38 schools which have sent reports in 1852 and 1853, 21 have increased in scholars, 18 in teachers, 9 in both; 8 have decreased in both respects: altogether they have 13 fewer teachers, and 216 more scholars than last year.

Six Committee meetings have been held during the year, and the operations of the Society have been more active and extended than during any previous year of its existence. The sales of books, &c., have amounted to 3039, the principal quantities being of "Prayers for the use of Families," and the list of "Scripture Lessons for 1853." The latter was published with a view to promote regularity of religious instruction, and to give teachers an opportunity for assisting each other in the preparation for their task. The sale of nearly the whole impression encourages the Committee to look forward to issuing a second list for 1854, and they hope also to find sale for a penny monthly commentary, aiding the teachers in preparation.

Mr. Freestone has acted during the year as Visitor, and by his untiring exertions the visiting system has proved eminently successful. He has paid 50 visits. The Committee express their deep value of his services, and sincerely regret that another engagement compels him to relinquish the office. Arrangements are made for immediately carrying on the plan to some extent, and it is hoped the Committee of next year will in no long time find some person fitted for the office of paid Visitor.

The Sunday-School Penny Magazine had a circulation throughout last year of upwards of 7000 a month. The change of editors which has taken place has not involved any change of character in the work, and its prospects appear now to be promising; while arrangements have been made with regard to the expenditure, with a view to place it on a safe and permanent basis. The continued aid of the friends of Sunday-schools in support of this little periodical, the Committee earnestly request.

After a reference to the "Lectures to Teachers" recently delivered, the report concluded with a few words of explanation relative to the pecuniary concerns of the Association, and an earnest petition for increased support

to enable the Committee to carry out the plans which were proving so useful throughout the district, but necessarily entailed an increasing expenditure.

The Treasurer's report shewed a considerable balance *against* the Association, arising from the increased expenses of the enlarged system of visiting, and from the subscriptions for last year not meeting this demand: the subscriptions for the present year were larger, but a farther effort would be required to liquidate all the claims arising from the present operations of the Society.

Various resolutions were proposed and seconded by Rev. F. Howorth, Mr. Rawson, Professor Bowman, Mr. W. Ashworth, Rev. Edward Higginson, Rev. F. Bishop, Rev. R. B. Aspland, Rev. M. C. Frankland and others, and unanimously adopted by the meeting. Repeated and earnest commendations of the Sunday-School Magazine were expressed, and the services of its editor (Rev. John Wright) gratefully acknowledged. The Table of Scripture Lessons, prepared and published by the Committee, received many expressions of approbation. The Chairman encouraged the Committee to proceed in their zealous labours, and not to be discouraged by the scantiness of the present funds, assuring them there was sufficient approbation of their labours in the commercial and trading classes of Manchester and its neighbourhood, to secure for them funds in future equal to their wants.—The next meeting of

the Society, it was announced, would be held at Stockport on Good Friday.—At four o'clock, the company adjourned to the school-room, where the tea-tables were bountifully spread, and a very numerous party assembled, every table being filled. The chair was taken by Professor Bowman, President of the Society. An excellent essay, abounding in practical suggestions, was read by Mr. Freestone, "On the Present Condition of our Sunday-Schools and the best Means of improving them." A very useful discussion of several topics suggested by Mr. Freestone ensued, in which many of the ministers and teachers present took part. The proceedings throughout the day were satisfactory and interesting.

NANTWICH.—On Sunday evening, March 13th, a sermon in reference to the death of the late minister, the Rev. F. Hornblower, was preached to a crowded and attentive congregation by the Rev. J. Robberds, B.A., of Toxteth Park, Liverpool. Many strangers were present from other congregations,—Wesleyans, for example,—and not a seat was unoccupied, many of the hearers being compelled to stand in the aisles, thus evincing, in a gratifying manner, the respect in which Mr. Hornblower was generally held in the town. It is to be hoped that the congregation will make exertions to provide themselves with a successor who may carry on his good work.

## OBITUARY.

1852. Aug. 3, of pneumonia, on her passage to Melbourne, near the Cape de Verdes, after an illness of three days, NANCY, wife of Mr. John STEVENSON, assistant surgeon, and second sister of Rev. F. W. Stevens, B.A., in the 23rd year of her age.

Cut down in the bloom of life, buoyant with bright hope for the future, and unconscious to the last of the solemn fiat which was being executed, and which brooked no delay, she passed out of life amid the noise of waters, from the manifold pleasures and cares and anxieties and passions and feverish struggles of this mortal state, to her final account.

No grassy hillock, or marble slab, or costly-sculptured symbol of the spirit's

flight, indicates the resting-place of her mortal remains to the mourning and bereaved: nought but the waste and drear expanse of the ocean gives answer, in its wild hoarse tones, where the heaving billows received her into their bosom.

"As well might you search out a vessel's path,  
Amid the gambols of the dancing waves."

Our sorrows are the springs of everlasting hopes. "Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God; believe also in Me."

1853. Feb. 22, at Stanstead Bury, Herts, ISAAC SOLLY, Esq., formerly of Leyton

House, Essex, in the 84th year of his age.

One of the last of the great merchants of a past generation, Mr. Solly estimated highly the importance of the vocation he was called on to fulfil, and faithfully and nobly laboured through a period of half a century to realize his own ideal. A high sense of honour, justice and integrity, formed the striking features of his character, and these qualities were combined with a rigid attention to all the details and enterprizes of an immense business. Throughout the last war he was a principal contractor for the supply of the Government dockyards with timber and hemp, and some idea of the magnitude of these operations may be formed from the fact of his sending orders on some special occasion to his agent in Dantzic to buy up the whole of the oak plank to be found in Prussia and Poland. He realized in the course of the war a large fortune, and, but for the misfortunes of others, seemed likely to have remained a wealthy man to the end of his days. But he considered that far more was required of a London merchant than merely the successful prosecution of his own private business. He justly felt the claims that society has upon the men who stand at the head of any great department of human affairs, for the promotion of such measures as, within that sphere, tend to advance civilization and add to the sum of human well-being. That generous public spirit which is the boast and blessing of our country eminently characterized the subject of our remarks, and accordingly, in the midst of the constant pressure of his own affairs, Mr. Solly laboured unweariedly in various public situations of commercial importance. As Chairman of the London Dock Company for more than twenty years, he greatly promoted the prosperity of the trade of London, and either initiated or supported most of those measures which experience has since proved to be beneficial.

At a time when Railway undertakings were viewed by the great London merchants with much distrust and suspicion, Mr. Solly saw the inestimable advantages of the plan, and as Chairman of the London and Birmingham Railway Company (since amalgamated into the London and North-Western), at once accepted the proposals of the Northern capitalists, and exerted himself with admirable energy, tact and judgment, to carry them into effect. In like manner he was one of the first to welcome and support the project of steam communication with America,

accepting in this case also the post of Chairman (for which his urbanity and business qualities well qualified him) of the British and American Steam Navigation Company. During the space of many years, first as a Director and afterwards as a Governor of the Royal Exchange Insurance Company, he held one of the most honourable positions in the City of London, and was mainly instrumental in forming the Fire Brigade Union among all the various Fire Insurance offices in the metropolis.

While, however, he threw himself thus heartily into enterprizes which his far-seeing and deliberate judgment sanctioned, his zeal was as discriminating as it was fervent. He was strongly solicited to become a Director and Chairman of the Company forming to make the Thames Tunnel; but, while he admired the boldness of the idea as a work of art, he did not deem it likely to be of sufficient use to warrant the enormous expenditure that would be required. The event has proved the correctness of his decision.

But it was not commercial enterprizes alone that received his support: he was a munificent contributor to many valuable charities, often giving to them that time and attention which are more than money. Among the number were the Orphan Working School, London Orphan Asylum, Small-Pox Hospital, (of which he was for many years Treasurer), St. Thomas's Hospital, and New-England Company, besides large contributions to the support of worship in the Dissenting denomination to which he belonged. A staunch friend to civil and religious liberty, he gave his help to all the liberal measures of this century, and took a leading part in the memorable Reform meetings of the city of London in 1831-32. At Mr. Grote's request, he twice proposed that gentleman for the representation of the city, and might himself have been proposed as one of his colleagues, had other claims upon his time and strength permitted.

He took a warm interest in the establishment of the London University, and was one of the original proprietors, regarding it as an important auxiliary both to the cause of religious liberty and of academical learning.

He was a regular attendant twice a-day, for a long series of years, on the religious services of the various excellent men who officiated at the old Presbyterian meeting-house, Marsh Street, Walthamstow, where for half a century his father and mother had worshiped before him, never allowing the ordinary excuses of

bad weather, visits of friends, &c., &c., to keep him from the house of prayer. After the decease or departure from Walthamstow of all the other supporters of that place of worship, he took a pew at the Hackney Gravel-Pit chapel, towards the building of which, many years before, he had been a liberal subscriber, and enjoyed the benefit of the services of the late Rev. Robert Aspland in the locality where, in his earlier years, he had listened to, and been in habits of most friendly intimacy with, Dr. Priestley and Mr. Belsham.

It is a slight but characteristic trait, that after his misfortunes compelled him to lay down his carriage, he continued, in spite of advancing years, to walk to and from the Gravel-Pit chapel (a distance of six miles), until several attacks of gout made it necessary to forego attendance on those public exercises of devotion, which for more than sixty years he had so uniformly engaged in and enjoyed.

The very heavy losses above alluded to, coming at successive periods, so weakened the firm of which he was the head, that in the great crisis of 1837 he was compelled to stop payment. The *Morning Chronicle*, March 6th, 1837, after speaking, in its City article, of the pressure on the money market, observes, "On the whole, the day has passed off better than was expected, and only two failures have yet been announced,—one in the Dantzic and Memel trade, and the other in the wool trade. From the many difficulties with which the first has had to contend, the trading community were not wholly unprepared for such an event, but the confirmation of their apprehension caused great regret, as the firm was of long standing, and the gentleman at the head of it was generally esteemed." The severity of the crisis is indicated by the remarks that follow, after acknowledging the judicious course pursued by the Bank of England: "Had not this timely step been taken, it is well known that many of the oldest houses in the City, and of undoubted means, must have fallen temporary victims to these severe times." The general regret experienced in the City at the news of his failure, and the notice taken of it in the above extract, such comments being unusual, manifested the high estimation in which he was held.

During the years of his prosperity, his house at Leyton offered an hospitable welcome to numerous guests of a great variety of ranks, both foreign and English, and among them the ministers of the old meeting, Walthamstow, ever found a

cordial welcome. From his extensive connection with commercial companies, few men in private life have had more opportunities of promoting the interests of others, and few ever used them more conscientiously. Seldom has a private gentleman left so many behind him, to remember him with gratitude, as, under God, the chief cause of their temporal advancement and happiness.

Since the period of his misfortunes, Mr. Solly had lived a comparatively retired life, though still exerting himself in business, as far as lay in his power, up to a year or two of his decease, enjoying that domestic affection and those literary tastes which through life had been his greatest earthly happiness, and partaking of that rest to which his long and useful life entitled him, and to which it was the delight of his children to contribute.\*

A gentleman whose character and position lend weight to his remarks, and who was delighted to recognize the value of Mr. Solly's kindness and help in former years, writes thus on hearing of his decease:

"I have never met with any case in which a man's character seemed to rise so nobly, to take a new flight as it were, as his did, after the troubles of '37. Had he continued a prosperous man to the end, all those finer qualities which shewed so beautifully in his latter years would have remained unknown. That God loveth whom he chasteneth, is a grand fact for all. But never did man seem to exemplify it more fully; for by the strength of a noble soul, he turned the very chastening itself into a source of joy for himself and all who knew him. May he now find in another world that higher peace which seemed in some mea-

---

\* It may be noticed as a characteristic circumstance, that, without ever having been accustomed to drink to excess, and liking a glass of wine as well as most men, yet at the age of twenty-six, having been advised, after a severe accident, to be very abstemious for a time, Mr. Solly resolved to drink nothing stronger than water till he should be seventy years of age. This resolution he rigidly adhered to in the midst of his constant hospitality and numerous public dinners, and during a period when such abstinence was considered more eccentric and irrational than even vegetarianism is at the present day. He attributed much of his singular equanimity of spirits and un-failing energies to the observance of this practice.

sure foreshadowed by the happy calm of his latter years."

Another gentleman, who saw much of Mr. Solly during the latter period of his life, and especially during his commercial troubles, observes, that he seemed to accept in a genuine spirit of piety those troubles as a chastening from God, and thenceforward with a determined will, that only could have been sustained by constant prayer, put away all those faults of pride or imperiousness which he felt, perhaps, had too much beset him, and which are not seldom found in connection with such unusual strength of will and energy. In fact, Mr. Solly's secret habitual piety was somewhat obscured, except to those most intimate with him, through an excessive fear of cant. But it shone out, undimmed by any clouds, in the evening of his life, shewing brighter and brighter as his days drew to a close. His medical attendant, a physician in the country, who knew how much he was suffering in his last illness from the progress of the disease (ossification of the heart and arteries), referring to the wonderful patience, cheerfulness and unselfish consideration for others, which Mr. Solly manifested, observed on one occasion, "I have never seen anything like this—never!" If the life-and-death struggle to breathe allowed a momentary interval, a smile of thankfulness and affection was sure to be seen, and a few broken words of devotion, or the name of the Saviour, would be heard. Once, after a long paroxysm of pain, he raised himself up and murmured, "I live by faith." A friend of the family, who was frequently by his bed-side in the last days of his existence, and who was deeply impressed by what she then witnessed, says, that after he seemed apparently unconscious, "words and sentences were occasionally heard, and even then prayer or devotion was their constant burthen. Throughout his illness, no murmur ever escaped his lips, no impatience was ever observed; if he was asked how he was, a cheerful reply was sure to be given; and when he was asked if his breathing did not give him great pain, he said, 'Oh no!' He was very fond of watching the setting sun; and when in health, even when feeble and weak, he would endeavour to walk to a favourite spot to see the sun go down, and admire the beautifully tinged clouds. A few days before his death, his breathing had forced him to sit up in bed, and during a short respite from pain, his attention was called to the snow-covered fields, and the glory of the evening sky. His eyes, before dim with pain,

brightened instantly, and he continued his gaze as long as his failing strength would let him, and turned in bed with his face to the window, that he might again see what he so dearly loved. Every servant in the house felt it a privilege to do anything, day or night, for one who was ever cheerful, patient, and so very considerate."

Such death-beds are full of blessedness, both to those who depart and those who are left to mourn their loss. But to lament and repine at such a death would be as ungrateful to our Merciful Father in heaven, as it would be unworthy of the loved and honoured friend who is "not lost, but gone before."—"Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord."

March 6, at his residence, Park Vale, Edgbaston, near Birmingham, in the 85th year of his age, Rev. JOHN KENTISH.

We are authorized to announce a Memoir of this venerable man in our next No. In the mean time we refer our readers to the just and affecting Funeral Address delivered by Rev. Samuel Bache, which we have been enabled to give in this No. of the Christian Reformer. From many Unitarian pulpits, the life, death, character and services of this distinguished minister received a fitting tribute of respect on the Sunday following the funeral. The Birmingham Newspapers have devoted elaborate articles to the same subject. A very admirable one, taken from the *Birmingham Mercury*, has appeared in the columns of our contemporary, *The Inquirer*. What follows is copied from the *Birmingham Journal*.

#### THE REV. JOHN KENTISH.

The remains of this venerated minister were interred in the Cemetery of this town on Tuesday last, after the celebration of a funeral service in the New Meeting-house.

Robert Scott, Esq., and Addyes Scott, Esq., of Stourbridge, and the Rev. John Kenrick, of York, were the mourners; Dr. Russell and Mr. W. H. Partridge, the medical attendants; and Mr. Timothy Kenrick, Chairman of the Vestry Committee. The pall-bearers were the Revds. J. J. Tayler, of Manchester; B. Carpenter, of Nottingham; W. Bowen, of Edgbaston; C. Clarke, of Birmingham; S. Hunter, of Wolverhampton; J. Gordon, of Coventry; J. Brooks, of Birmingham; and T. Bowring, of Birmingham. A numerous body of those who had assembled at the chapel, in addition to the gentlemen already named, accompanied the body in procession to the Cemetery,

where, after another short funeral service, it was consigned to its resting-place. Among the gentlemen who attended were Henry Smith, Esq., J. T. Lawrence, Esq., J. F. Ledsam, Esq., H. Luckcock, Esq., S. Thornton, Esq., R. Martineau, Esq., A. Kenrick, Esq., Dr. Bell Fletcher; the Revds. Messrs. Ryland, and G. Davis, of Evesham; Messrs. A. Peyton, T. W. Blakeway, F. Osler, T. Osler, Brooke Smith, &c., &c.

The most casual observer must have perceived, from the character of the procession and the numbers by whom it was accompanied, that a person of note had passed from among us. Had such an observer entered the New Meeting-house, and listened to the address which was there delivered by Mr. Bache, he must have felt that the tribute of respect which was being paid was but justly due. That address was remarkable for the simple truthfulness with which it was conceived, and a stranger would have been able to understand that it answered to the reality of the case. The character it delineated was so natural, that it carried the evidence of its verisimilitude upon its face.

We were particularly struck with the reference made by Mr. Bache to the relation in which Mr. Kentish stood to his brother ministers; and it was, indeed, worthy of notice, that one who occupied his station in society should have manifested so strong an attachment as he did to his ministerial calling. Throughout life he discharged the duties of that calling with the most admirable diligence, regarding its engagements and pursuits as the paramount objects of his exertion. Born with large worldly expectations, and placed at an early period in a high social position, he devoted himself to the work of the Christian ministry with all the singleness of purpose which could distinguish the humblest of his class. He excelled others in the labours of a student, and preacher, and pastor; so that it would be difficult to find an individual whose whole mind and soul were more entirely given up to the administration of the religious interests entrusted to his care. His pulpit services always possessed the value which a clear appreciation and an independent treatment of the subject in hand gave to them. Every point was considered with a conscientious carefulness, and urged with earnest fidelity. He practised no oratorical arts, nor did he indulge in literary ornament; but, in addition to the sterling thought which his sermons conveyed, they acted upon the hearers with that power which great sincerity of feeling never fails to produce.

His influence out of the pulpit was scarcely less extensive than that of his public ministrations. Among the most marked characteristics of his conduct was the attention he paid to the welfare of the young; and there are many who look back upon his watchfulness over them as constituting one of the chief blessings of their lives.

For fifty years Mr. Kentish had been, nominally, the minister of the New Meeting-house, and during more than forty of these he was actively employed in the work of his office. Previously to his settlement in Birmingham, he had officiated at Plymouth and Hackney, his residence in those places extending over a period of thirteen years. He was born at St. Albans, in 1768, and was therefore in the 85th year of his age at the time of his death.

In the early part of his life he was noted for his scholarship, and he continued to the last to add to the reputation he then obtained. Learning of the most severe and extensive kind was perseveringly cultivated by him; and he has not left behind him a nobler specimen of a man thoroughly acquainted with the peculiar knowledge of his profession. His numerous works will always indicate for him the character of one of the best furnished theologians of his day. His varied information constituted one of the principal charms of an intercourse with him, for he had it ever at command for the purpose of both instructive and amusing use.

His natural aptitudes were eminently those of a scholar; and perhaps the most decided feature of his intellect was the correctness by which it was distinguished. It would, we believe, be impossible to point out in any of his productions the slightest perversion of fact; and his statements were as free from exaggeration as they were from misrepresentation. In the smallest as well as in the greatest matters, he took every possible pains to avoid mistake; and he invariably adhered to the exact state of the case with which he had to do, as far as he could ascertain it. He was, in the highest sense of the phrase, an accurate man. No one could listen to him, either in public or in private, without being impressed with the singular appropriateness and precision of his language. This accuracy, which ran through all his natural habits, was reflected in the strict rectitude which marked his fulfilment of all the moral relations he sustained. It modified his taste as well as guided his actions. He was moved to greater delight by what was

correct than by what was powerful; and few men could more effectually resist the influence of mere mental power in biasing the judgment.

It often happens that such a tendency as we have described is united with a certain coldness and hardness of disposition; but this was not the case in the present instance. Mr. Kentish was a most genial companion, full of liveliness and humour, and excelling in the exercise of a pointed conversation. He possessed, too, a warm and generous heart, ever open to the claims of friendship and the appeals of distress. He had a delicacy of feeling, as well as a depth of affection, which made him especially dear to those whom he loved. Of his benevolence it may be said that "his works praise him in the gates," though it is also true that the principal part of those works were done in secret. To plans of charity which strongly engaged his approval, his pecuniary gifts were munificent; but besides these objects of his particular favour, nothing of this kind, which he could consistently support, called to him for aid in vain. His time and attention, as well as his wealth, were ever at the service of human want.

Any account of Mr. Kentish would be essentially incomplete which did not mention his attachment to freedom. He retained his own convictions with great tenacity; but he was unaffectedly anxious to grant to others the independence of judgment which he demanded for himself. Bigotry and intolerance were strange things to him; and though slow in the formation of new opinions, his native candour led him, even in old age, to re-consider and re-construct his views in obedience to every light of truth which

shone upon him. Freedom of action was treated by him as a necessary consequence of freedom of thought; and he was thus an ardent friend of both civil and religious liberty. On the latter subject, the doctrines he held were of the most advanced kind, and his sympathies in this direction were as strong as they were unprejudiced.

Mr. Kentish's personal manners were of the old school, as his appearance betokened; and he had a preference for established methods of procedure as compared with modern innovations. Whatever tended to the preservation of domestic virtue and order he fondly cherished; and he was accustomed to revert with pride to the times when the virtues of the English character were of a more distinctively home growth than they at present are. His departure from life was in beautiful harmony with this prevalent tendency of his thoughts, for within an hour of his conducting a religious service in the bosom of his family, he was summoned to join the nobler worship of the skies.

---

1852. Oct. 25, at Flagg, Derbyshire, Mr. BENJAMIN MARSDEN, aged 73 years.

---

1853. Jan. 1, at Flagg, Derbyshire, Mrs. SARAH MYCOCK, aged 75 years.

---

Jan. 31, at Flagg, Derbyshire, ROBERT HARRISON, aged 80. He discharged his duties as clerk at the Unitarian chapel until within a fortnight of his decease. The general respect and esteem in which he was held in the village was evinced by the attendance of some portion of the members of nearly every family in the village. His end was peace.

---

## MARRIAGES.

---

Feb. 17, at the Presbyterian chapel, Bank Street, Bury, by Rev. F. Howorth, Mr. JOHN MILLS, of Bridge Hall, near Bury, to JANE, fifth daughter of the late Mr. James HOOD, clothier, Edinburgh.

---

Feb. 17, at Mill-Hill chapel, Leeds, by Rev. Charles Wicksteed, Mr. FREDERICK BUXTON, engineer, to AMELIA, daughter of Mr. John ATKINSON, all of Leeds.

---

March 12, at the Abbey chapel, Tavistock, by Rev. James Taplin, Mr. JAMES BROAD to Mrs. S. JAMES.

---

March 17, at the Ancient chapel, Toxteth Park, Liverpool, by Rev. Francis Bishop, Liverpool, Mr. WILLIAM BROWN to Miss HANNAH KELLY, of Aigburth.